

Property of
U. P. E. I.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE
AND
WORLD PEACE

CS

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND WORLD PEACE

*Being the Burwash Memorial Lectures
delivered in Convocation Hall
University of Toronto
November, 1921*

BY

THE HON. NEWTON W. ROWELL
K.C., LL.D.

TORONTO
VICTORIA COLLEGE PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1922

JX
1975
.R85

028422

BURWASH

MEMORIAL LECTURESHIP

When the late Nathanael Burwash, President and Chancellor of Victoria College for so many years, had reached the Jubilee of his ministry, the event was signalized by the creation of a foundation of five thousand dollars to be known as the 'Burwash Memorial Lectureship'. The object sought was to perpetuate the memory of faithful and distinguished services by securing for future years 'an agency by which the truths, studies, and causes in which Dr. Burwash had been interested might find from time to time such further exposition as scholarship would be able to supply and as the coming generations would require that the truth might make them free'.

Copyright, 1922, by Victoria College, Toronto

FOREWORD

THE committee appointed to select the second lecturer in the Burwash Memorial Lectureship series had the happiness to secure the Hon. N. W. Rowell, K.C., LL.D., a distinguished Canadian citizen. Mr. Rowell had recently enhanced his reputation as an exponent of high matters of Church and State by a notable part taken at the Assembly of the League of Nations. Being well known as a careful student of political principles and a wise interpreter of national conditions, it was assured that his handling of the problem of the maintenance of World Peace would be illuminating and constructive. Large audiences in the Convocation Hall of the University of Toronto listened to these addresses and gave liberal indication of their appreciation. This volume, containing these lectures in but slightly altered form, is issued in the certain confidence it will contribute to a right understanding, more particularly on the part of Canadian citizens, of a problem of paramount importance and urgency. In this, as in other social problems of human welfare, the right attitude of will and feeling is not in itself sufficient.

There must also be the right understanding. And to this there is no royal road. Patient investigation, sympathetic reading of other nations' histories and literatures, travel and sojourn within their borders, a cosmopolitan and liberal mind are required. To this end the chapters of this volume will make a worthy contribution.

R. P. BOWLES.

VICTORIA COLLEGE.

PREFACE

THE following lectures were delivered at the University of Toronto under the Burwash Lectureship, Victoria College, during the last week of November 1921.

The general theme of the lectures is World Peace, and the design is : to set forth the necessity for international co-operation for its preservation ; the methods from time to time suggested and employed for its maintenance ; the part played by the British Empire in promoting and preserving peace ; and the interest of the people of Canada in the question by reason of (1) their membership in the League of Nations, (2) their citizenship in the British Empire, (3) their place in the family of nations, and (4) their adherence to the Christian faith. As Canada is entering upon new experiences in the larger life of the British Commonwealth and of the world the problems arising out of Imperial and International relationships are of ever-increasing interest and importance to Canadians.

At the time the lectures were delivered the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments was in session. The Conference, which was formally opened on the 12th of November 1921, concluded its labours on the 6th of

February 1922. During the Conference the following treaties and resolutions were agreed upon by the parties concerned and announced to the Conference :

1. A treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, limiting naval armament.
2. A treaty between the same Powers, in relation to the use of submarines and noxious gases in warfare.
3. A treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, and Japan, signed 13th December 1921, relating to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the Pacific Ocean.
4. A declaration accompanying the above Four-Power Treaty.
5. A treaty between the same Four Powers, supplementary to the above, signed 6th February 1922.
6. A treaty between Japan and China relating to Shantung.
7. A treaty between Nine Powers relating to principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China.
8. A treaty between the Nine Powers relating to Chinese customs tariff.
9. Two resolutions relating to the appointment

of a Commission of Jurists to consider amendments of the Laws of War.

10. A resolution regarding a Board of Reference for far Eastern questions.
11. Nine resolutions relating to various matters affecting China.

The treaties relating to the limitation of naval armament and the Pacific Question are so important, and have such a direct bearing on the problems discussed in these lectures, that they are published as an appendix to the lectures.

The position of the British Empire as a leader in the movement for the limitation of armaments and the preservation of peace was more than maintained at the Conference. Her acceptance of the proposal of the United States for equality of naval strength was not forced upon her by the dramatic proposal of Mr. Hughes at the opening of the Conference, but was deliberately decided upon some months before at the Conference of Prime Ministers and representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions, and India, held in London in June, July, and August 1921. The attitude of the members of the British Commonwealth was clearly defined in Resolution No. 6, in which the position of equality with the naval strength of any other Power was accepted as the standard for the Empire. This decision, which was reached by unanimous agreement of all the members of the Commonwealth, made possible

the acceptance of Mr. Hughes's proposal, and was a striking manifestation of the spirit and determination of the British Empire to do everything possible to contribute to the success of the Washington Conference.

The result of the Conference has justified the high hopes entertained for its success, but the failure either to make any progress with the limitation of land armaments or to reach an agreement on the limitation of the construction of submarines has occasioned disappointment to those interested in the cause of World Peace. There is, however, no real ground for disappointment as to land armaments, as it must have been obvious from the beginning that a Conference as restricted in membership as was the Washington Conference could not deal adequately with land armaments.

The proposal of the British Empire to abolish completely the use of submarines in warfare evoked widespread sympathy and strong popular support; and, while it failed of acceptance by reason of the attitude of the other Powers, it undoubtedly led to the adoption of the second treaty, limiting the uses of submarines in warfare, which, if honestly observed, means that the world will be spared the repetition of the worst horrors of submarine warfare. The failure of the Conference to reach an agreement even to limit the number of submarines was due to the attitude of

France and the restricted membership of the Conference.

The conclusion of the Five-Power Treaty on the limitation of naval armaments and the Four-Power Treaty on Pacific questions, has removed causes of grave misunderstanding on the Pacific, and has contributed greatly to good relations between the British Empire and the United States. The treaties relating to China are notable in that they represent an honest effort on the part of the Powers assembled not to take advantage of the weak and defenceless position of China to plunder her, or to deprive her of territory, but to restore the territories already taken, and to preserve her against encroachments in the future. This evidences a new spirit in international relations.

The treaties have now been ratified by the United States Senate, the Four-power Treaty by a majority of four over the necessary two-thirds, and subject to a general reservation which does not appear to be vital. The President in his address to the Senate in presenting the treaties, said: 'If to these advanced expressions of the conscience of leading Powers, if to these concords to guard against conflict and lift the burden of armament, if to all of these the Senate will not advise and consent, then it will be futile to try again.'

While the treaties agreed upon are of great

significance in the interests of World Peace, there are other aspects of the Conference of much greater significance.

1. The Conference has been accepted as indicating that the United States is prepared to resume her place at the Council table of the nations and to assume her share of responsibility for the maintenance of World Peace, and world stability. If the Conference means this, it is its greatest achievement, for it is the world's greatest need.

2. The Conference has undoubtedly removed causes of possible misunderstanding between Great Britain and the United States, and has made easy, and, let us earnestly hope, assured, permanent co-operation in the interests of Peace between the British Commonwealth and the United States.

3. It has once more vindicated diplomacy by Conference, the principle underlying the organization of the League of Nations, and has gone a long way to remove aggressive force as an element in diplomacy.

The Conference organized its Committees and carried on its work in substantially the same manner as the League of Nations. The treaties are in the same form and are executed in the same manner as the treaties of peace at Paris.

Could the League of Nations have accomplished these results? No, because the United States is not a member of the League. The League could have accomplished these results, and probably

substantially greater results, if the United States had been a member of the League, or willing to co-operate with the League in its work.

Toward the conclusion of the Washington Conference a Conference of the Powers was called to meet at Genoa on the 10th of April, 1922, to consider the economic conditions of Europe. The basis of the Conference is the recognition by all Nations accepting the invitation of the following principles :

1. Non-interference in the economic and political organization of other nations.
2. Protection to foreigners and foreign capital.
3. Recognition of public debts and obligations.
4. The provision of means of foreign exchange which offer sufficient guarantees.
5. Abstention from political propaganda and aggression on other nations.

Russia has accepted the invitation. The economic distress in Europe and the absolute necessity of International co-operation, if the economic structure of Europe is to be rehabilitated, should ensure the success of the Conference. If the Conference succeeds it will naturally be followed by the re-admission of Russia into the family of nations, a fact second only in importance to the return of the United States to active participation in International affairs.

During the Conference the Anglo-Irish negotiations, which had been pending for some weeks,

resulted in an agreement whereby Ireland was granted Dominion status. The agreement is so important in itself, and has such an immediate bearing upon the future of the British Commonwealth and of Anglo-American relations, that it is published as an appendix to the lectures. It has been approved both by the British Parliament and the representatives of Ireland, as required by its terms, but not without strong opposition in both Assemblies. Many very grave difficulties have yet to be overcome, but, given good faith and honest and patriotic effort on both sides, success should be achieved, and a new era in Anglo-Irish and Imperial relations inaugurated.

With respect to Egypt, the negotiations which have been referred to in the lectures failed to result in agreement. The Government of Adli Pasha resigned. Riots occurred in Cairo and other centres, which were suppressed by the Military. Zaghlul Pasha was deported. On the 28th day of February, as a result in part at least of strong representations by Lord Allenby, the following proclamation was issued :

WHEREAS His Majesty's Government in accordance with their declared intentions desire forthwith to recognize Egypt as an independent sovereign State ; and

WHEREAS the relations between His Majesty's Government and Egypt are of vital interest to the British Empire ;

The following principles are hereby declared :

1. The British Protectorate over Egypt is terminated, and Egypt is declared to be an independent sovereign State.

2. So soon as the Government of His Highness shall pass an Act of Indemnity with application to all inhabitants of Egypt, martial law as proclaimed on the 2nd of November, 1914, shall be withdrawn.

3. The following matters are absolutely reserved to the discretion of His Majesty's Government until such time as it may be possible by full discussion and friendly accommodation on both sides to conclude agreements in regard thereto between His Majesty's Government and the Government of Egypt :

(a) The security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt :

(b) The defence of Egypt against all foreign aggression or interference direct or indirect :

(c) The protection of foreign interests in Egypt and the protection of minorities :

(d) The Sudan.

Following this proclamation a new Egyptian Ministry, under Serwat Pasha, has been formed, and the deadlock which existed since the resignation of the Adli Pasha Administration has been broken.

I am indebted in the preparation of these

lectures for valuable suggestions to Mr. Loring C. Christie, legal adviser of the Department of External Affairs, to Professor George M. Wrong and Professor R. M. MacIver, of the University of Toronto, and to the Rev. Trevor H. Davies, D.D. I am also indebted to Mr. Lewis Duncan, barrister, of Toronto, for valuable assistance in the examination of the literature on the questions covered by the lectures, and in the verification of authorities.

N. W. R.

TORONTO, *1st March* 1922.

ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION AND WORLD PEACE

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION ESSENTIAL TO PEACE	1

The Nation-State no longer an adequate form of political organization, 1. Force no longer a sane or practicable method of settling disputes between nations, 2. Human society now one living organism, 3.

Peace, not war, the normal condition of civilized mankind, 4. Present-day war differs from war in the past in three fundamental respects: First, the destructive character of the weapons used, 5; Secondly, the forces engaged, 6; Thirdly, the area of the conflict, 7.

Analogy between the development of the rule of law in the State and the development to be expected in the international field, 7.

The two problems of to-day are, what form of international co-operation can be introduced to supplement the Nation-State in the political organization of society, and what method can be devised to take the place of force in settling disputes between nations, 8.

The attempts made to solve these two problems: First, the attempt to construct a World-State or Imperium, 9. Rome and the Pax Romana, 10. Spain, 12. France, 12. Germany, 13.

Secondly, the Balance of Power and Military Preparedness, 14.

Thirdly, International Arbitration and the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, 16.

CHAPTER II. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN HISTORY	24
--	----

Early proposals, 24. The grand design of Henry IV, 24. Penn's *Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe*, 25. St. Pierre's plan, 26. The proposal of Alexander of Russia, 27.

The Covenant of the League of Nations, 29.

The features of the League, 31. Diplomacy by Conference, 31.

Settlement of disputes by arbitration or conciliation if possible, 32. The Covenant to preserve territorial integrity, 33.

The establishment of a permanent Court of International Justice, 33. Plans for the reduction of armaments, 33.

Registration of International Treaties, 33. Abrogation of agreements inconsistent with the Covenant, 34. The Covenant provides for International Co-operation, 34.

xviii ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Difficulties facing the League, 34. The position of Germany, 35. The condition of Russia, 37. The attitude of the United States, 38. Turkey and the East, 39.	
CHAPTER III. ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LEAGUE	41
First, the organization and functioning of Council and Assembly, 41.	
Secondly, the establishment of a permanent Court of International Justice, 41.	
Thirdly, Disarmament, 42. Previous movements in favour of limitation of armaments, 42. The effort of Great Britain in 1870, 43. The first Hague Peace Conference, 44. The provisions for disarmament in the Treaties of Peace and in the Covenant of the League, 46. Disarmament work of the Council and Assembly of the League, 47. The work of the Disarmament Conference at Washington, 47. The attitude of France at the Washington Conference, 49. The proposed Treaties of Guarantee for France, 51.	
Fourthly, the settlement of political questions by the League of Nations, 55. The Aaland Islands Dispute, 55. Upper Silesia, 56. Serbia and Albania, 63. Dr. Benès' suggestion for Regional Conferences, 67.	
The League should include all nations, 68.	
What should be the attitude of the peoples toward the League? 70.	

PART II

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER IV. THE EMPIRE'S PLACE AMONG THE NATIONS	71
Description of the British Empire, its extent, distribution, population, and trade, 71. Religions represented in the Commonwealth, 74.	
CHAPTER V. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BRITISH STATE	76
Britain's contribution to peace in the sphere of internal government, 76. Benefits conferred upon the individual, 76. The political organization of the State, 78. Representative and Responsible Government, 79. The supremacy of the civil over the military power, 80.	
CHAPTER VI. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMONWEALTH	82
Characteristics of the British Commonwealth: the position of the Sovereign, 82.	

- The absence of any Central Parliament and Executive, 84.
 Methods of consultation between the different members of the Commonwealth, 85. The Colonial Conference of 1887, 85. The Colonial Conference of 1907, 86. The Imperial War Cabinet of 1917, 86. The Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives in 1921, 86.
- The legislative and administrative freedom of the self-governing members of the Commonwealth, 87.
- The diversity in forms of government throughout the Commonwealth, 89. The principle underlying this diversity in forms of government, 90.
- Ireland, 91.
- India and the East, 94.
 The problem of the East, 94. The challenge of the yellow races, 95. Nationality and self-determination, 96. The religious question in the East, 97. The Nationalist movement in India, 98. Amritsar, 99. Swaraj, 100. The non-co-operation movement, 100.
 The economic situation, 102.
 The Government of India, 103. Relations with the Native States, 104. The effect of British Rule in India, 105.
 Steps taken to give India self-government, 105. The proposals of 1917, 106. The Government of India Act of 1919, 107. The opening of the Central Parliament in 1920, 110. Speech by the Duke of Connaught, 110.
 The problems presented by the association of India with the other peoples of the Empire, 111. First, the status of Indians in other portions of the Empire, 112. The Resolution of 1918, 113. The Resolution of 1921, 113. Secondly, the position of India in Imperial and other Conferences, 114.
 India is moving toward full responsible government, 115.
- Egypt, 116. Proclamation of Protectorate, 116. British intervention in Egypt under Mr. Gladstone in 1882, 117. Lord Milner's mission to Egypt, 119. Three main factors in the situation, 120. Recommendations of the Milner Commission, 120. Subsequent developments, 121.
- Mesopotamia, 122.
- Palestine, 124.
- Southern Rhodesia, 125.
- British East Africa, 128.
- The freedom of the seas and necessity for an adequate navy, 130.
 Navy required for purposes of defence, 130. Strategic distribution of members of the Commonwealth makes navy essential, 130.
- Members of Commonwealth enjoy all the blessings of peace which the Imperium of Rome conferred on the world, 132.
 Peace within and without the Empire, 133.
- British Empire is organized for peace, not war, 134.

	PAGE
CHAPTER VII. THE EMPIRE'S DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE	136
Support of Arbitration as a means of settling International Disputes, 136. Arbitration under Oliver Cromwell, 136. The Jay Treaty, 137. The Treaty of Ghent of 1814, 138. The Treaty of Washington of 1871, 139. The Behring Sea, the Venezuela Boundary, the Alaskan Boundary, and the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitrations, 139. Proposed Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty of 1897, 140. General Arbitration Treaty by Great Britain and France in 1903, 140. Similar Treaty with the United States in 1908, 141.	
Establishment in 1914 of Permanent Peace Commission for settlement of disputes between Great Britain and the United States, 141.	
Great Britain's support of the first Hague Peace Conference in 1899, 142. Great Britain and the second Hague Peace Conference in 1907, 142.	
The Empire's support of the League of Nations and permanent Court of International Justice, 143. Commonwealth strongly behind the League of Nations, 145.	
The Contribution of the Commonwealth to World Peace in the future, 146. The Racial Problem, 148. The effect of the unity of the Empire in the late war, 148.	
The Commonwealth the greatest force for stability and security throughout the world, 151.	
The Commonwealth as a British League of Nations has elements of strength which the League of Nations does not possess, 153.	
The peace of the world will not be advanced by the Balkanization of the British Empire, 154.	

PART III

CANADA AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER VIII. TWO CONFEDERATIONS: A CONTRAST	156
Canada and Germany, two Confederations formed in 1867; comparison of the two States, 156. Lord Bryce on Canada, 159.	
Canada has stood for peaceful settlement of international disputes, 159.	
Canada's support of the League of Nations, 160.	
CHAPTER IX. CANADA'S PLACE IN THE EMPIRE	161
Canada's contribution to the strength and stability of the Empire, 161.	
Responsible Government, 161. Lord Stanley in the great debate of 1844, 162. Recognition of colonial self-	

government has made possible the unity and strength of the Empire, 164.

Canadian Confederation, 164. Contemporary conception of the destiny of Canada, 165. Connexion between Canada and Motherland strengthened by Confederation, 166.

Equality of status, 166. Colonial Conference of 1887, 167. Colonial Conference of 1907, 167. Imperial War Cabinet, 170. Resolution of Imperial War Conference of 1917, 170. Equality of status strengthens the Empire, 172.

Imperial citizenship, 174.

CHAPTER X. CANADA'S EXTERNAL RELATIONS . . . 176

The admission of the Dominions to the Peace Conference and to membership in the League of Nations, 176. The United States and Russia have not recognized the new position of the Dominions, 179.

Co-operation of the Commonwealth and the United States, 181. Opportunity of Canada, 182.

Canadian representation at Washington, 182. Question first raised in 1892 by Dalton McCarthy, K.C., 183. Statement of 10th May, 1920, 184. Trade relations between Canada and the United States, 186. Political relations of Canada and the United States, 186.

Canadian representation in London, 192. Status of Canadian High Commissioner, 193.

Canadian representation in the League of Nations, 193.

Canadian participation in the Councils of the Commonwealth, 194.

CHAPTER XI. CANADA'S DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE . . . 196

Disarmament.

Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817, 197.

Canada's land forces, 198. Canada's military expenditure, 198.

Canada's naval defence, 200. Naval Conference of 1909, 201. Naval understanding of 1911, 201. Differences of opinion as to naval policy in 1912, 202. Canada does not expect taxpayers of Great Britain to pay for naval defence of Canada and Canadian shipping, 202.

International Arbitration, 203. The Behring Sea, Alaskan Boundary, and Atlantic Fisheries Arbitrations, 203.

The International Joint Commission, 203.

Canada's contribution to the solution of the racial problem, 205.

Canada's contribution to World Peace in the future, 208.

A non-partisan political creed for Canadians, 210.

PART IV

THE CHURCH AND WORLD PEACE

	PAGE
CHAPTER XII. THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	211
The first Christian note was one of peace and goodwill, 211.	
A spiritual Kingdom and brotherhood of man, 212. Christianity not nationalistic but universal, 213. St. Augustine, 213. The Holy Roman Empire, 214. The temporal power of the Papacy, 214.	
Islam a militant religion, 214. The extension of Islam, 214.	
The Islamic revival a challenge to Christian faith, 216.	
The Wars of Religion in Europe, 217. Political liberty grew out of the struggle for religious liberty, 217.	
The Church must rely on spiritual resources for the achievement of her tasks, 218.	
The solidarity and universal brotherhood of the race the only sure basis for World Peace, 219.	
The menace of the racial problem, 219. The racial problem can never be solved by the civil power alone, 219. The contribution of the modern Missionary Movement toward the solution of this problem, 220. The missionary is the principal incarnation of the spirit of human brotherhood to the Eastern nations, 222. The missionary enterprise contributing to the development of native leaders, 222. The effect of nationalistic sentiment upon the missionary enterprise, 223.	
The national problem is not confined to white and yellow races, it extends also to the white and black races, 224.	
Force no solution, 226. Human brotherhood the only solution, 226. The Church has made a greater contribution toward a good understanding between the East and the West, and between the Black and White races, than any other agency, 227.	
Duty of the Church to wage war against racial prejudices, racial animosities, and international ill will, 227.	
The Church must support the new international ethic of right and justice in the mutual relations of States, 228.	
CHAPTER XIII. THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	230
Next to the racial problem the industrial problem is the most difficult and menacing, 230.	
The effect of the industrial revolution, 230. The worker treated as a commodity, 232. The unequal distribution of wealth, 233. The so-called capitalistic organization of society, 233.	
The challenge of Marxian Socialism, 234.	
Labour's demand for partnership in industry, 235.	
The International Labour Organization provided for by the	

Treaty of Peace, 238. The United States and Russia still outside the International Labour Organization, 240. Co-operation between Labour, Capital, and Society, 240. The General Conference and the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization, 241. The Director of the International Labour Organization, 243. Work of the International Labour Organization, 243.	
Failure of Marxian Socialism in Russia, 244. Lenin's confession of defeat, 245.	
The dictatorship of the proletariat no solution of the industrial problem, 247.	
Capitalistic domination of industrial conditions no solution of the problem, 248. Capitalistic attempt to prevent Inter-Church World Investigation of some phases of the Industrial problem, 248.	
The problem cannot be solved by war between Capital and Labour, 250.	
The ideal of co-operation expressed in the Peace Treaty is fundamentally right, 250. Human nature does not vary in capitalist and worker, 250.	
What contribution can the Church make to the solution of the industrial problem? 250. The Church is awakening to the importance of the issue, 251. It is not the function of the Church to solve the industrial problem, but the Church cannot ignore the problem, 252. The Church must create the atmosphere of brotherhood without which the problem cannot be solved, 252.	
Principles upon which all men may agree, 252. Principle of brotherhood must be insisted upon, 255. Canada peculiarly well suited to make a real contribution toward the solution of the problem, 255.	
CHAPTER XIV. THE CHURCH AND NATIONAL IDEALS	257
The influence of ideas on great masses of people, 257. The militarization of the German people, 258. False national ideals lead to disaster, 258. The ideals of justice, brotherhood, and service must become the ideals of the children, 259. The war has given democracy a new meaning, and peace has given it a new opportunity, 261. The imperative duty of every citizen to serve the State, 261. The opportunity of the Church to proclaim the duties of citizenship, 262.	
CHAPTER XV. THE CHANGING RELIGIOUS ORDER	264
APPENDIX A. ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT for a Treaty between Great Britain and Ireland	267
APPENDIX B. A TREATY between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, limiting naval armament	276
APPENDIX C. FOUR POWER TREATY relating to Insular Possessions and Dominions in the Pacific Ocean	300

PART I

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER I

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION ESSENTIAL TO PEACE

Two of the outstanding lessons of modern history are that the Nation-State is no longer an adequate form of political organization to meet the needs of human society, and that force is no longer a sane or practicable method of permanently settling disputes between nations. Outside of Germany these two conclusions were obvious to thoughtful men before the last war. The War has emphasized them with such compelling force that even the dullest should not fail to comprehend.

That humanity had outgrown the Nation-State as the only form of political organization has been recognized for more than a century ; the problem has been to supplement it by some practicable form of international organization. The Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe were both attempts to meet the situation, but each in turn proved entirely inadequate. There is no finer, and yet more pathetic sight in modern history, than the heroic but futile efforts of Viscount Grey, in July, 1914, to avert the impending catastrophe

The
Nation-
State.

by securing some conference of the Powers to consider the questions that had arisen between Austria and Serbia. The Concert of Europe had broken down, and there was no organization which could be called to consider the dispute, or to mediate between the parties. Mr. Lloyd George recently stated that had such an organization as the League of Nations existed in July, 1914, the War might have been averted, and humanity saved the loss and suffering which the War entailed.

That force is not a sane or practicable method of permanently settling disputes between nations had also been recognized by thoughtful men outside of Germany long before the War. Here again the problem was to find some other method of settlement applicable to all nations. The Hague Peace Conferences and the movements for the limitation of armaments were all steps in this direction, but these were all insufficient, and disastrously failed to meet the situation in August, 1914.

While the political organization of society still takes the form of the Nation-State, we all recognize that every other great expression of human thought and activity transcends national boundaries. The intellectual, moral, and spiritual ideas of mankind recognize no territorial limits, nor any particular form of sovereignty. The achievements of science are not the peculiar possessions of any one people but are the common

property of all men. Trade, transportation, and finance have all been internationalized, and war, pestilence, and famine, the three great scourges of humanity, refuse to be stopped by national frontiers. The political organization of society has not kept pace with human progress.

Human society is now one great living organism, each part dependent more or less upon the others and unable to function properly except as part of the whole. Through this organism the currents of thought and of aspiration, of trade and of finance have flowed, impeded or interrupted perhaps at times, but still flowed in ever-increasing strength and volume, giving life and vigour to the whole. This world-wide organism was broken and partially dismembered by the War, and certain sections are to-day dying from loss of vitality due to impeded or interrupted circulation. In certain sections of Europe civilization is in process of disintegration. No one who looks out upon the world and appreciates its disorganization and suffering can doubt for a moment that what our humanity needs, and needs most, is rest and peace, rest and peace to give opportunity for recuperation and the re-establishment of the circulation of those international currents which are the life-blood of organized society.

The exhaustion and paralysis of certain sections of the world are so great that restoration must be a slow process and will be extremely difficult,

but the difficulty only makes an adequate effort the more urgent. Humanity will not settle down after this world-wide conflagration and devote its thought and its efforts to peaceful pursuits unless it has some assurance that it will not be plunged into war again in the near future. What are the prospects ?

War in
the past.

Peace and not war is the normal condition of the civilized races of men. While war is as old as recorded history, in all civilized communities it has been looked upon as an evil, though in some cases a necessary evil. Prussia is the only State which in modern times has been an exception to this rule. She has taught that war was a biological necessity, and that it was the highest expression of national life. To-day not only Germany, but the whole human family, is paying the penalty for this false teaching. Because war is as old as recorded history, there are those who tell us that man has always fought, that man will always fight, and that, therefore, all efforts toward international co-operation for the preservation of peace must end in failure, and that practical men should not spend their time on such impracticable proposals.

War, as we know it to-day, is not an ancient method of settling international disputes—it is a wholly modern method—one might almost say a twentieth-century method. War to-day differs from war in the past in three fundamental respects :

First—in the destructive character of the weapons used ;

Secondly—in the magnitude of the forces engaged ; and

Thirdly—in the areas and people affected by the conflict.

In the past the weapons used have varied according to the age and progress of civilization, and until modern times the effectiveness of these weapons has been limited to the immediate theatre of conflict. There is now absolutely no limit one can place upon the character or the destructive power of the weapons which are or may be at man's command for the future. Before the last great war we thought of science as the handmaid of civilization, as the gift of a good God to lighten the burdens of human toil, to ease human suffering and to aid humanity in its long march to a better social and industrial order and a higher civilization, but we now realize that it is science which has given us guns with a range and capacity for destruction hitherto undreamed of, and which menaces the existence of human habitations, the works of art and architecture, the finest creations of human genius, scores of miles from the scene of conflict. It is science which has given us the aeroplane, the submarine, and the tank, the liquid fire and the poisonous gas ; it has turned bacteriology, designed to prevent the spread of epidemics, into the means of propagating

Weapons
used.

them, and has placed in the hands of men the power so to organize and utilize the forces of nature as to place all civilization in jeopardy. We know the horrors of the last war, but who can tell the unspeakable horrors of the next if one should come ?

On the 17th September 1919 Sir Oliver Lodge, speaking to students, said, 'Hitherto man has utilized mainly the energy of molecular forces such as steam and electricity, but now science has its finger tips upon atomic energy, such as is partially displayed by radium. There is enough intra-atomic energy', he said, 'in a mass of matter no larger than a man's fist, to lift the German Fleet from the bottom of the sea and put it on a Scottish mountain. God forbid', he added, 'that science should cast its harness over atomic forces to the full extent before we are fit to handle them. Put such a prodigious power into our possession in the present state of civilization of some nations, and with it they could destroy humanity and perhaps the planet.' And yet some men still scoff at all efforts to provide a substitute for war. Man's control over physical forces is in great danger of outstripping his sense of moral responsibility for their use.

The
forces
engaged.

In the past, war has been waged by uniformed professional soldiers of more or less limited numbers. It is to-day no longer a conflict between uniformed professional soldiers, but between the

organized man-power and resources of the contending nations; it is a life-and-death struggle, and everything that modern science can command and human ingenuity can devise is thrown into the struggle for mutual destruction, and nations stake their very existence on the issue. The nations cannot afford to settle their disputes by war.

Formerly the area of conflict might be confined to the actual parties to the dispute. To-day this is no longer possible. So long as war could be localized and limited to the parties concerned, it was a possible, though a barbarous, method of settling disputes between nations. It was while war could be so localized and its effects largely confined to the belligerents that the Doctrine of Neutrality was developed. Neutral powers might stand aside and permit belligerents to fight out the issue, profiting, perchance, rather than suffering from the conflict of their neighbours. To-day, apart from actual casualties in the war, the neutral may suffer almost as much as the belligerent state. No one will to-day deny that war is world-wide in its effects, and that all humanity may be prejudiced by it.

The
area of
conflict.

Just as in the development of society within the Nation-State the blood-feud and private vengeance were superseded by Courts of Justice and the 'rule of law', because the blood-feud and private vengeance were destructive to the peace

and well-being of the local community, so, may we not now ask, in view of the present day organization of society, that no State should be permitted to choose a method of settling a dispute with its opponent which inevitably causes loss and suffering to its peaceable neighbours? Has not humanity, as a whole, the right, as a matter of self-defence and for the preservation of civilization, to say to disputing States, 'You must choose a method of settlement which does not inevitably entail loss and suffering to your neighbours'?

To say that war has been and that, therefore, war always will be, is a counsel of despair, and to stay one's hands and see civilization drift to impending catastrophe is a confession of the failure of modern statesmanship and the bankruptcy of our so-called Christian civilization. One cannot believe that statesmanship is bankrupt or that Christian civilization has wholly failed. One does not believe that the world is getting worse, but that it is getting better and that the genius and capacity which men of our day have displayed in working out plans for international co-operation in every realm, except that of political organization and government, will be equal to the task of completing that system of international co-operation.

The two greatest problems facing the world to-day, and upon the satisfactory solution of which the future of society depends, are: (1) What

form of international co-operation can be introduced to supplement the Nation-State in the political organization of society? and (2) What just and honourable method can be devised to take the place of force in settling disputes between nations? We need the broad view and the long vision if we are to reach wise conclusions.

What light does history throw upon the answers to these grave questions? Four different ideas or ideals have been dominant at various periods of history:

- I. The World-State or an Imperium.
- II. The Balance of Power and military preparedness.
- III. International Arbitration as a substitute for war.
- IV. The establishment of a League or Association of Nations for the preservation of peace.

Rome is the conspicuous example of a State conferring on the then civilized world the advantages of peace through the extension of her Imperium. World-State or an Imperium.

The conquest was slow and halting at times, the Senate hesitated and compromised, and during this period of uncertainty, when Rome was by far the most powerful State bordering on the Mediterranean, she was the cause of many wars and much misery among the States lying on the confines of her Empire. But with the establish-

ment of the Empire and the extension of her rule there was ushered in an era of peace such as had not been before and has not been since. Greek thought and the Roman Road and the Roman Law were the great unifying forces. There might be wars on the frontiers or skirmishes with the Picts along the Hadrian Wall, but throughout the vast Empire which basked in the Mediterranean sun there was profound peace—the Pax Romana.

When ultimately Rome fell before the inroads of the barbarians, so strong was her prestige that the theory of a universal empire lingered and mitigated the harshness of the conditions. The Holy Roman Empire, expressing the Germanic-Christian ideal, which one may date from the crowning of Charlemagne as Emperor, at St. Peter's in Rome, on Christmas Day, A.D. 800, was founded on the tradition of Rome and on the conception of one universal Christian government. The great Italian poet who wrote of Pope and Emperor as 'the two suns whose several beams cast light on either way' was himself firmly convinced that a universal monarchy was necessary for the welfare of mankind, and he supported the pretensions of the Empire as against the Papacy.¹ Petrarch too, contemplating both the glory and the tranquillity of the past and the disorders and dangers of the future, pinned his

¹ *De Monarchia*.

hopes for peace on the supremacy of the Emperor. Thus in his letter to the Roman people :

‘ When was there ever such peace, such tranquillity, such justice, such honor paid to virtue, such rewards distributed to the good and punishment to the bad, when was ever the state so wisely guided as in the time when the world had obtained one head and that head Rome ? The very time wherein God deigned to be born of a virgin and dwell upon earth. To every single body there has been given a head ; the whole world therefore also, which is called by the poet a great body, ought to be content with one temporal head. For every two-headed animal is monstrous ; how much more horrible and hideous a portent must be a creature with a thousand different heads biting and fighting against one another ; if, however, it is necessary that there be more heads than one, it is nevertheless evident that there ought to be one to restrain all and preside over all, so that the whole body may abide. Assuredly both in Heaven and earth the sovereignty of one has always been best.’ ¹

These hopes were doomed to disappointment. The national and religious forces at work were too strong both for the tradition of the Holy Roman Empire and for the authority and organization of the Papacy. Europe at the conclusion of the Middle Ages, it has been pointed out, was a great church and empire breaking up into distinct kingdoms and national or voluntary churches ; it was a group of monarchies in which popular

¹ Quoted by Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire* (1905), p. 271.

freedom had been gradually developing ; it was a group of States which balanced themselves uneasily against each other, liable, therefore, to be thrown off the equilibrium by the preponderance of any one of them. While the Holy Roman Empire lingered on the stage until August 1806, when Napoleon brought it to an end, it had long since lost its vitality and power.

We trace in history subsequent attempts to establish an Imperium, the effort of Spain under Philip, and the stupendous effort of France under Napoleon. It is interesting to recall that Napoleon in his exile at St. Helena explained to the world, through his secretary, Las Cases, the great ideal towards which all his efforts had been directed. He had aimed, he said, 'at concentrating the great European peoples, divided hitherto by a multiplicity of artificial boundaries, into homogeneous nations, out of which he would have formed a confederation bound together by unity of codes, principles, opinions, feelings and interests'. At the head of this League under the aegis of his Empire he had dreamed of establishing a central Assembly modelled on the American Congress or the Amphictyonic Assembly of Greece to watch over the common weal of 'the great European family'. The dream had been dissipated by his ruin, but he prophesied that it would yet be realized sooner or later, 'by the force of circumstances'. 'The impulse has been given and I do

not think that after my fall and the disappearance of my system there will be any other great equilibrium possible in Europe than the concentration and confederation of the great peoples. The first sovereign who in the midst of the first great struggle shall embrace in good faith the cause of the peoples will find himself at the head of all Europe and will be able to accomplish whatever he wishes.' ¹

Finally, there was the effort of the German Empire under the Hohenzollerns. All these efforts to dominate Europe have failed; nor has any one of them approached the vastness and the power of Rome.

Is an Imperium similar to that of Rome possible in Europe and throughout the world?

'No one who reads the history of the last three hundred years—no one, above all, who studies attentively the career of Napoleon—can believe it possible for any state, however great her energy and material resources, to repeat in modern Europe that part of ancient Rome: to gather into one vast political body races whose national individuality has grown more and more marked in each successive age.' ²

It has been suggested, however, that while a new World-State cannot be established by the sword, it may be and should be created by the assent and co-operation of the nations of the world; and that

¹ *Cambridge Modern History* (1907), vol. x, p. 1.

² Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire* (1905), p. 442.

it is only by the creation of such a World-State that we can hope for permanent peace. The latest exponent of this idea is Mr. H. G. Wells in his *Salvaging of Civilization*. He paints a most vivid and appealing picture of the need of humanity for a better political and social order ; with that need all must sympathize. How is this need to be met ? 'The project of a world-wide League of Nations is not sufficient for the needs of Europe ; the idea of a World-State is a sounder and more hopeful proposition.' Whatever the future may have in store, it needs but very slight knowledge of the present international situation to realize that such an ideal is thoroughly impracticable at the present time, and, if civilization is to be preserved, we must move forward along lines that are practicable.

Balance
of power
and mili-
tary pre-
pared-
ness.

Upon the destruction of the Germanic-Christian ideal the statesmen of Europe were faced with the anarchy which Petrarch had foreseen. Europe now consisted of a number of independent States with no recognized authority to keep the peace between them, and she was given over to war. Religious, dynastic, strategic, and commercial questions kept the cauldron seething. The Imperium had gone. Was Europe to be devastated with perpetual wars ? The solution tried at the Peace of Westphalia—the peace of exhaustion which terminated the Thirty Years War—was that of the balance of power ; that is to say, the political maxim that no single State ought to be

suffered to become strong enough to overpower the aggregate strength of the rest or some considerable but undefinable proportion of that strength.¹ Such a maxim was no real solution. The only check on war was the doubt whether the group of powers being so evenly balanced, victory could be counted on ; and it was assumed that no nation was likely to commence an aggressive war unless there were reasonable hopes of victory. If the general balance was not upset war could be waged successfully by the strong against the weak. This opened a wide field to astute diplomacy and to military adventure. If war was suddenly sprung and quickly terminated, strategic pieces of territory could be grabbed without disturbing the European balance and precipitating a general conflagration. Prussia utilized this advantage to the full in her wars against Austria, Denmark, and France ; and other nations were not wholly free from similar action. Such a system led to the piling up of armaments. An increase in one camp required a corresponding increase in the other, plus a margin for safety. One result was the adoption by many of the principal countries of Europe of conscription, and an increase in standing armies. The last great war was the culmination of this system and its final condemnation.

¹ *Lectures on Diplomacy*, by Montague Bernard (1868), p. 97, quoted by Phillimore, *Three Centuries and Peace* (1917) ; and see Phillimore, *Commentaries of International Law*, vol. ii, sec. 45.

The balance of power and military preparedness offer no hope to humanity at the present time.

Inter-
national
arbitra-
tion.

Arbitration as a means of settling international disputes may almost be said to have been the discovery of the Greeks,¹ but while the democracies of the Greek city states were partial to this method of settling disputes, they were not less partial to war.

While the Greek cities quite commonly had recourse to arbitration amongst themselves, imperious Rome never arbitrated her disputes with her neighbours. The sword was her arbitrator. Occasionally Rome was asked to act as arbitrator in disputes between States on the confines of her Empire, but that was all.

As might be surmised, there are numerous examples of resort to arbitration or mediation after the fall of the Roman Empire, although in some cases it is difficult to say whether arbitration or mediation was the method adopted. Clauses for the arbitration of future difficulties were common in treaties negotiated by the Swiss and in agreements between Italian cities.² The Popes constituted themselves judges of all cases and evoked to their tribunal all differences between peoples and kings. Innocent III declared that the Pope was the sovereign mediator on earth,

¹ ' L'arbitrage international est réellement une découverte absolument particulière à la vie publique des Hellènes ' (A. Raeder, *L'Arbitrage international chez les Hellènes*, Aschehoug, Christiania, 1912, p. 1).

² Vattel, *Le Droit des Gens*, L. ii, c. xxviii, sec. 329,

and Alexander VI, by a decision which resounded throughout the world, traced an imaginary line from pole to pole dividing the possession of all discoveries in the New World between the Spaniards and the Portuguese.¹ The authority and prestige of the Papacy were shared by its Bishops, to whom many disputes were submitted for arbitration. The Emperors, during the Holy Roman Empire, rivals of the Popes in their claim to universal supremacy, were not recognized as arbitrators to anything like the same degree as was the Papacy. Whenever they were so accepted everything was carefully excluded which might have implied their supremacy over other monarchs. In preference to the Emperor other kings were not infrequently chosen. Thus Louis of France was chosen judge between Henry III of England and his barons in 1263,² and there are early cases on record where the arbitrators chosen were of much more humble rank.³ Coming to more modern times, we find Oliver Cromwell an advocate of arbitration as a method of settling international questions.⁴ For

¹ Merignhac, *Traité théorique et pratique de l'Arbitrage international*, quoted by J. B. Moore, *International Arbitrations*, Washington (1898), vol. v, p. 4826, a work to which the writer is indebted for several of the illustrations used.

² De Flassan, *Histoire générale et raisonnée de la diplomatie française*, 2nd ed., i, p. 124.

³ See Hall, *International Law*, 6th ed., 1909, p. 142, for a case where in 1299 A.D. commissioners sat in Paris to redress damages done to merchants of various nations by a French admiral within the English seas.

⁴ For details see *infra*, Part II, Chapter III.

nearly two centuries, however, arbitration fell into disuse, although there are one or two conspicuous illustrations of its adoption. Great Britain and the United States were leaders in the movement for the revival of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. The Jay Treaty in 1794 is a landmark in the history of this revival, and each decade has seen an increase in the number of disputes settled by arbitration.

In 1856, at the close of the Crimean War, the Treaty of Paris, to which Great Britain was a party, contained important provisions with respect both to mediation and the limitation of war. Article VIII of the Treaty provided that in case of misunderstanding between Turkey and any of the other signatories, mediation was to be resorted to before force was employed. This was developed in the Twenty-third Protocol into the following significant expression of opinion :

23rd Protocol. 'The Plenipotentiaries do not hesitate to express, in the name of their governments, the wish that States between which any misunderstanding may arise should, before appealing to arms, have recourse, as far as circumstances might allow, to the good offices of a friendly power.

'The Plenipotentiaries hope that the governments not represented at the Congress will unite in the sentiment which has inspired the wish recorded in the present Protocol.'

The expression of a pious hope may be evidence of good intentions, but good intentions are not always effectively translated into acts. Little

resulted from the Treaty of Paris. Fifteen years later, however, there was signed between Great Britain and the United States the Treaty of Washington, 1871, which provided, *inter alia*, for the settlement of the *Alabama* claims by arbitration. This arbitration gave a great impetus to the modern movement.

International arbitration received a further recognition at the first Hague Peace Conference in 1899, when the so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration was established and a general form of Arbitration Treaty was approved. This form, however, excluded questions affecting the vital interests, the independence, or the honour of the two contracting States, or concerning the interests of third parties. At the time the first Hague Conference was held the Powers were not prepared to agree to a general and unlimited Treaty of Arbitration.

International arbitration was, however, placed on a firmer footing by the conclusions reached at the second Hague Peace Conference in 1907, and the procedure for carrying on such arbitrations was improved by the decisions reached at this Conference. The first general arbitration treaty, in the form approved at the first Hague Peace Conference, was concluded between Great Britain and France in 1903. Since that date similar general conventions of arbitration have become common, and no less than ninety had been com-

municated to the Permanent Office of the Hague Tribunal down to 1910.

A further and very important step was taken in 1914, when the United States concluded a Convention with Great Britain for the establishment of a Permanent Peace Commission to investigate and report on all disputes between the two nations of every nature whatsoever other than 'disputes, the settlement of which is provided for, and in fact achieved, under existing agreements'. The Convention further provides that neither party is to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted. The Treaty does not abrogate the existing arbitration treaties, but it constitutes a real advance on them, in that there are no reservations of questions of 'vital interests' or 'national honour', and that there is a positive covenant not to resort to war until the conclusion of the investigation and the presentation of the report.

Important and valuable as international arbitration has proven itself to be, its weaknesses were twofold. First, no nation was under obligation to submit its disputes to arbitration, and, secondly, the arbitrators were chosen after the dispute arose, and, consequently, political as well as judicial considerations entered almost inevitably into the decision reached.

A judicial settlement of a dispute premises the existence of a code of law. Arbitration is not

altogether dependent on a pre-existing general law, for the parties may define the law. Neither in the Greek, the Roman, nor the Holy Roman Empires was there any serious attempt to develop international law. The germs of such a system might perhaps be found in the *ius naturale* and *ius feciale*, but the theory of a universal empire prevented the development of any system regulating the relations between those independent States which were still gradually emerging from an all-embracing feudalism. It was under the shadow of the miseries and desolation of the Thirty Years War that Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) produced his great work, *De Iure Belli ac Pacis* (1625). This book laid the foundation of international law. His system did not aim to prevent war. It sought to define the laws of war and peace and to make them, if possible, more humane. Those of war are given first. Grotius's definition of international law shows both the indefiniteness of that subject and the sources from which he considered it to be drawn. 'International law,' he says, 'is that which regards the mutual relations of several peoples or rulers of peoples, whether it proceed from nature, or be instituted by divine command, or be introduced by custom and tacit compact.'¹

While there has been a steady growth of international law since the days of Grotius, it is still in process of development. Since it originates in

¹ Grotius, 1.

sources so diverse and constitutes a mosaic of parts of such widely differing authority, there is difficulty in applying the word 'law' to the subject. It is worthy of note that one great branch of the subject, that of the Prize Court Law, was largely developed in the local courts of the nations at war, and it is a great tribute to the impartiality and judicial qualities of those distinguished English judges, of whom Lord Stowell was chief, that the rules laid down by them have been followed in other jurisdictions. Of these decisions that great American jurist, Chancellor Kent, has said: 'There is scarcely a decision in the English Prize Courts on any general question of public right that has not received the express approbation and sanction of our national courts.'¹

Leading jurists and statesmen have recognized the importance of the creation of a Permanent Court of International Justice to which the nations might submit their disputes for judicial determination, and efforts have been made to constitute such a court, but, until the present year, without success. The United States has been the leader in the movement for the creation of a Permanent Court of International Justice. At the Second Hague Conference in 1907 she brought forward a proposal for the creation of such a court, and under the leadership of Mr. Choate, the chief American delegate, supported by Great Britain

¹ Kent, *Commentaries*, vol. i, p. 70.

and other Powers, the proposal took form, and an agreement was reached on all points save that of the method of electing the judges. The proposal failed by reason of inability to agree on this vital point. The movement in the United States did not, however, end. It was strongly supported by influential leaders in both political parties, and the Republican programmes of 1916 and 1920 called for the constitution of such a court. Public opinion in many other countries also strongly favoured the proposal.

But neither voluntary agreements for arbitration, nor Hague Arbitration Tribunals, nor even a voluntary Court of International Justice—if it could then have been constituted—nor all these combined, important and valuable as they all are, could meet the world's need, because none of them provided for continuous co-operation among the nations in dealing with international affairs. Experience shows that the Nation-State alone is no longer an adequate form of political organization to meet the needs of human society. There must be some organized form of co-operation for the preservation of peace to supplement the Nation-State. What should be the form of such an organization ?

CHAPTER II

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN HISTORY

Schemes
for a
League
or Asso-
ciation of
Nations.

TWENTY-EIGHT schemes have been put forward from the time of Henry IV of France to the end of the nineteenth century for the establishment of a League or Society of Nations.¹ Of these schemes it is proposed to refer to only four: the grand design of Henry IV; the proposal of William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania; that of L'Abbé St. Pierre; and that of Alexander the First of Russia.²

The grand design of Henry IV³ was conceived

¹ The text of the principal proposals will be found in Dr. E. Darby's *International Tribunals*, Dent, 1904. Ter Meulen in *Der Gedanke der internationalen Organisation in seiner Entwicklung*, Nijhoff, The Hague (1907), mentions twenty-nine between A. D. 1300 and A. D. 1800.

² The Amphictyonic League of Greece is sometimes mentioned as a precursor of the League of Nations. From the oath taken by members of the Council it would appear that the league was in the nature of a treaty that there should be no war between its members; and an alliance against any who should attack any of its members. The oath was as follows: They would destroy no city of the Amphictyons, nor cut off their streams, in war or peace, and if any should do so, they would march against him, and destroy his cities, and should any pillage the property of the god, or be privy to or plan anything against what was in his temple at Delphi, they would take vengeance on him with hand and foot and voice and all their might. See Grote, *History of Greece*, 1869, vol. ii, pp. 249, 251. It is an early example of an international agreement which aimed at regulating methods of waging war. The Confederacy of Delos and the Achaean League were more clearly associations of States in one common foreign policy.

³ Sully, *Mémoires, Œconomies royales*, tom. vi, pp. 129 seq. See Butler, *Studies in Statecraft*, 1920, pp. 65 seq.

in fear of the power of Spain. His plan was to divide Europe between fifteen great Powers on such an equal basis that the balance of power could not be disturbed. There was to be a General Council in continuous session to pass laws calculated to cement the union of the States and to maintain order. There was to be a combined army and navy. As Spain would not have relinquished any of her possessions without a war, the scheme never passed into the realm of the practical.

In 1693, William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, wrote his 'Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe'. The pamphlet is elaborately and clearly reasoned out. One quotation will be sufficient to give the general design :

'Now if the sovereign princes of Europe, who represent that society, or independent state of men that was previous to the obligations of society, would, for the same reason that engaged men first into society, viz. : love of peace and order, agree to meet by their stated deputies in a general diet, estate or parliament, and there establish rules of justice for sovereign princes to observe one to another ; and thus to meet yearly, or once in two or three years at farthest, or as they shall see cause, and to be styled "The Sovereign or Imperial Diet, Parliament or State of Europe", before which sovereign assembly should be brought all differences depending between one sovereign and another that cannot be made up by private embassies before the sessions begin ; and that if any of the sovereignties that constitute

these imperial states shall refuse to submit their claim or pretensions to them or to abide and perform the judgement beyond the time prefixed in their resolutions, all the other sovereignties, united as one strength, shall compel the submission and performance of the sentence, with damages to the suffering party, and charges to the sovereignties that obliged their submission, to be sure, Europe would quietly obtain the one much desired and needed peace to her harassed inhabitants ; no sovereignty in Europe having the power and, therefore, cannot show the will to dispute the conclusion ; and, consequently, peace would be procured and continued in Europe.'

Penn's proposal also contained a provision for the limitation of armaments. Penn foresaw, as our wisest statesmen do to-day, that these proposals must go hand-in-hand. There is no evidence that this proposal was seriously considered at the time.

Charles Irénée Castel de St. Pierre was in Utrecht during the negotiations which led up to the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht in 1711. During his stay there he published anonymously his project for a perpetual peace, which soon became widely known. His project was founded on that of Henry IV. He proposed a European league or a Christian republic, of which the members were to renounce the right of making war against one another and to delegate their disputes to the arbitration of a Central Assembly of the Allies, whose decision was to be enforced if necessary by

a common armament. It is said that Fleury, the French statesman and prelate, to whom he communicated his plan, replied: 'Vous avez oublié un article essentiel, celui d'envoyer des missionnaires pour toucher les cœurs des princes et leur persuader d'entrer dans vos vues.' Frederick the Great, writing to Voltaire, declared: 'The thing is very practicable, it only needs, in order to succeed, the consent of Europe and several similar bagatelles.' Leibnitz wrote, 'I remember an inscription in a cemetery—"pax perpetua".'

The scheme was great in its conception, but it failed of realization. It was in advance of the age. It, however, has provided a basis for many subsequent proposals. The ideas of St. Pierre were elaborated and expounded by Rousseau in France, Kant in Germany, and Bentham in England, but they were unable to convince the nations that such an arrangement was practicable.

Almost a century after St. Pierre published his project the Napoleonic wars forced the question to the front again. This time it was the Russian Emperor, Alexander the First, who appeared as the spokesman for humanity. His proposal made in 1804 was that a general treaty should form the basis of the relations of States forming the European confederation. 'Why should we not submit to it the positive rights of nations,' the Emperor asked, 'assure the privilege of neutrality, insert the obligation of never beginning war until all the

resources which the mediation of the third party could offer have been exhausted, until the grievances have by this means been brought to light, and an effort to remove them has been made? On principles such as these one could proceed to a general pacification and give birth to a league in which the stipulations would form, so to speak, a new code of the law of nations, while those who should try to infringe it would risk bringing upon themselves the forces of the new union.'

This was Alexander's proposal, but Napoleon was not yet defeated. Many years of war were to follow, and before peace was finally consummated Alexander had substantially modified his plans. The actual result was the Holy Alliance, an alliance of Princes to maintain the existing order and forms of government in Europe. The cause of its failure grew out of the purpose for which it was formed, and the policy of intervention in the affairs of other States which it sought to execute. Great Britain refused her support to the policy of intervention in Spain, and, later, France refused her sanction to the policy of intervention in Italy.

Another century passed and the world was again convulsed with war, so all-embracing in its sweep, involving such sacrifices of life and property, and characterized by such crimes and suffering that the heart of humanity cried out for relief from the burden and horrors of war, and demanded some

guarantee against its repetition and some saner method for settling international disputes.

That movement culminated in the Covenant of the League of Nations embodied in the Treaty of Versailles.

Versailles
and the
League of
Nations.

In some quarters it appears to be overlooked that while President Wilson was the most powerful advocate of the League at the Peace Conference of Versailles, the movement was not American in its origin, although the League to Enforce Peace, of which the Hon. W. H. Taft, the present Chief Justice of the United States, was President, and which was organized in 1916, was one of the first organizations, if not the first, to endeavour to enlist the support of public opinion for a real League or Association of Nations as part of the peace settlement. The demand for the League was almost universal, and it was humanity's cry which found voice in many lands. Leaders of thought in the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, China, Japan, India, South Africa, and Canada, all gave voice to this aspiration and hope. There does not appear to be any question that at the time Mr. Wilson proposed the League of Nations he voiced the sentiments of the American people. The Democratic programme in the Presidential Election of 1916, on which Mr. Wilson carried the country, included an item pledging the United States to international co-operation in securing settled peace and justice in the world,

and to join with other nations in the establishment of a feasible association of nations that would secure these purposes. Mr. Hughes, his Republican opponent and present Secretary of State of the United States, was also an advocate of the League or Association of Nations. Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points, communicated by him to Congress in an address delivered in January 1918, contained the following as the Fourteenth Point :

‘ A general association of nations must be formed under satisfactory covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.’

There does not appear to have been any dissent from this proposal of the President. He was speaking for the whole nation. The Fourteen Points were accepted by the enemy and allied Powers as the basis of peace, and the War came to an end on the specific agreement between all the Powers concerned that a League of Nations should be formed for the purpose of preserving the peace thus secured.

Every one must recognize the great loss which the League and humanity have sustained by reason of the non-participation of the United States in the work of the League, but one cannot believe that the people of the United States will withhold permanently their co-operation from this great enterprise which their country was so

influential in launching, which she stipulated that other nations should accept, and which is so completely in accord with her best traditions.

The project for the formation of a League of Nations is not new. What is new and significant is, that what was but an ideal before the War has now become a practical reality, and fifty-one nations, representing more than three-quarters of the entire human race, are pledged to make it a success.

What are the purposes and methods of the League, and what ground have we for hoping that those purposes will be realized ? The primary purpose of the League is to preserve the world's peace by providing a substitute for war as a means of settling international disputes. Its secondary purpose is to provide a means of international co-operation in a large number of important matters of common concern to all the nations, thereby removing causes of international friction and promoting a good understanding between the nations. The League seeks to accomplish these great purposes by the following principal methods :

Purposes
and
methods.

First: It provides for what may be truly described as diplomacy by conference, to supplement the ordinary and traditional forms of diplomacy. It was not until the Supreme War Council was constituted and the heads of the Allied States met together to work out plans for co-operation that victory and peace were brought

within measurable distance. Every one familiar with the conduct of affairs of even minor importance must realize the obvious advantage of having the parties who are conducting an important and delicate negotiation meet face to face in order to discuss their respective points of view and to endeavour to reach a common understanding. The League, through its Council and Assembly, provides this common meeting-ground where the representatives of the nations may meet with a view of discussing matters of common concern, and removing causes of international bitterness, and international friction, which, unless removed, may lead to international strife.

Secondly : All nations, members of the League, have entered into a Covenant, each with the other, that they will submit all international disputes, which they are unable to settle by ordinary diplomatic methods, either to arbitration or to judicial determination or to conciliation by the Council, and that they will not resort to war until three months after the decision has been rendered or the Council has made its report. If the dispute is submitted to arbitration, they bind themselves to carry out the award.

Any State which violates these stipulations becomes, by such violation, at war with all the other members of the League, and they are under covenant to institute immediately an economic boycott of the offending member ; the Council

is also required to consider and recommend to the members the necessary military measures against the offending State.

Thirdly : The members of the League enter into a mutual Covenant to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League.

Fourthly : The Covenant provides for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice for the judicial determination of disputes between nations. Of this I shall speak later.

Fifthly : It recognizes that huge military armaments tend to promote war, and that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety ; and that the members of the League should interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval, and air programmes, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes. The Council of the League is required to formulate plans for the reduction of armaments for the consideration and action of the several Governments, members of the League.

Sixthly : Secret treaties are recognized as one of the prolific causes of international misunderstandings, and it is provided in the Covenant that

‘every treaty or international agreement entered into hereafter by any member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall, as soon as possible, be published by it, and no such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.’

Seventhly: The members agree that the Covenant of the League is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and they solemnly undertake that they will not thereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

Eighthly: The Covenant provides for international co-operation in a large number of questions of vital moment in which all States are interested, including the promotion of the well-being, physically, morally, and intellectually, of industrial wage earners, particularly the protection of children, young persons, and women in industrial employments; public health; the maintenance of freedom of communication and transit, and the equitable treatment of the commerce of all members of the League; and the supervision of the conventions relating to the opium traffic, the suppression of the white slave traffic and kindred matters.

Difficulties
of the
situation.

It is not possible to appreciate what the League has already accomplished or to estimate what it may accomplish in the future without a frank

recognition of the difficulties of the present international situation. I shall refer to only a few of the most obvious.

The first is the position of Germany. Every intelligent student of international affairs recognizes the dominating position of the German people in Central Europe, their industry, their organizing ability, and their industrial efficiency. Nothing but the complete destruction of civilization in Europe can prevent the German people from being the most powerful single factor in the industrial, economic, and political life of Western and Central Europe. What is the political position? When Germany sued for peace on the basis of Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points, it was open to the Allies to accept or refuse. Some thought the time had not yet come to make peace, but the Allies decided to do so on the basis of the Fourteen Points, subject to one reservation and one interpretation. Whatever one's feelings may have been about Germany and her people by reason of the course she pursued during the War, no one will seriously question that once she laid down her arms on certain defined conditions, those conditions should have been embodied in the Treaty of Peace. Unfortunately, some of these conditions were very vague and were capable of more than one interpretation. When the terms of the Treaty were submitted to Germany, she strongly protested that they were not in accordance with the condi-

tions on which she had laid down her arms. This was denied by the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany was compelled to sign, but there is no question that in the minds of the German people there is the deep-seated conviction that, after she had laid down her arms upon defined conditions accepted by the Allies, advantage was taken of her position to impose on her obligations contrary both to the letter and the spirit of the Fourteen Points. This has undoubtedly affected her attitude toward carrying out the Treaty. Without undertaking to discuss the German point of view, whether we affirm or deny that there is any justification for it, we cannot change the fact of its existence, and its existence is one of the disturbing factors in the European situation. If this feeling continues to exist, will not Germany some day demand redress? And the issue must be settled by the sword unless, in the meantime, such an international organization is established as will guarantee peace for the future and will permit of reasonable readjustments in the terms of the Treaty, based on justice and fair play all round, should experience show such readjustments to be necessary. It is because France is apprehensive of the Germany of the future that she refuses to disarm or substantially to limit her land armaments. In the absence of a League of Nations or some other international organization for the preservation of the peace, there are inherent in the settle-

ment made in Paris the elements of future world-wide conflagrations.

Secondly: The condition of Russia. What we claim for ourselves we must accord to the Russian people. The British people have always insisted on the right to determine their own form of government, free from all intervention from any outside power. This has been their settled policy ever since they refused to recognize the political authority of the Pope when he sought to intervene on behalf of King John as against the barons and to annul the Magna Charta. They refused their support to the Holy Alliance because of its policy of intervention in the affairs of independent sovereign States. In considering Russia, we should never forget the vital part she played in the early days of the War. She poured out her blood without stint in the common cause, and there should be, in all the allied countries, the most appreciative feeling for the patience, the heroism, and the sacrifice of the Russian people. International plans which would ignore Russia are doomed to fail, for Russia with over one hundred and twenty millions of people must in time rank with Germany and France as one of the three most powerful European continental Powers. We should not permit our dislike of Bolshevism and of its leaders to induce us to ignore the Russian situation. If Russia prefers the Soviet form of government to that of the Czar, and if she is prepared to keep

the peace with her neighbours, we have no right to question her choice of the form of her government.

It should be the policy of all believers in international peace to support the establishment of commercial relations with Russia at the earliest possible date. Every one recognizes the great difficulties of the situation, but these difficulties must be faced. The conditions in Russia render unstable both the political and industrial conditions in Europe and the East.

Thirdly: The attitude of the United States. No one can question the devotion of the people of the United States to the ideals of peace and of international justice. They have stood for these ideals for the past hundred years. Those ideals were expressed, with almost unequalled clarity and force, by Mr. Wilson while President of the United States. One cannot but believe that the same ideals have inspired the calling of the present Disarmament Conference in Washington,¹ and that whatever may have been the attitude of the United States during the past two or three years, we may look forward to her co-operation with other nations in the future to restore peace and order to the world. The United States, by reason of her population, her resources, the character and temper of her people, and her

¹ On references to the Washington Conference throughout these lectures see Preface, pp. vii-xii, and Appendices B and C, pp. 276-307.

position of detachment in reference to European affairs, is able to exert a more powerful influence in the interests of world peace and stability than any other power save the British Empire. Until the final attitude of the United States is known on the broad question of international co-operation for the preservation of peace, it will be impossible to judge the future.

Fourthly: Turkey and the East. When the Armistice with Turkey was signed on the 30th October 1918 the Turkish Empire was on the verge of collapse, and had it been possible to conclude a treaty of peace at that time or within a reasonable period thereafter, the Eastern situation might have been cleared up. But with the delay of over a year in settling the terms of the Treaty, the whole conditions in the East changed; the Nationalist movement in Turkey had time to gather strength and establish itself in Asia Minor; the Caliphate movement had time to spread through the Mohammedan world and demand the maintenance of the integrity of the Turkish Empire; differences of opinion among the Allies, both as to the policy in the East and as to the division of the territories detached from Turkish sovereignty, developed; and finally the defeat of Venizelos in Greece and the restoration of King Constantine all contributed to make the problem increasingly difficult of solution and added to the world-wide unsettlement and unrest.

The recent action of France in concluding an independent agreement with Kehmal Pasha, the head of the independent Turkish Nationalist Government of Angora, contrary to the Treaty of Sèvres and contrary to what has been the agreed policy of the Allied Powers in the East, has added a new complication to the many already existing, and placed one more severe strain upon British sympathy and co-operation. A better understanding between Great Britain and France would appear to be one of the urgent needs of the European situation.

It is in the face of these difficulties and the inevitable unrest and unsettlement flowing from them that the League has been compelled to take up and pursue its task.

CHAPTER III

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LEAGUE

WHAT has the League so far accomplished toward the carrying out of these great purposes ? I shall only refer to a few of its achievements.

Accom-
plish-
ments of
the
League.

First: The actual organization and successful functioning of both the Council and the Assembly. The result has demonstrated the practicability of 'diplomacy by conference', the meeting face to face of representatives of the nations to discuss matters of grave moment and of common concern, and the reaching of agreements and understandings which otherwise would have been impossible.

Secondly: The League has established a permanent Court of International Justice for the judicial settlement of international disputes. The constitution of the Court was finally settled at the meeting of the first Assembly of the League. The judges were elected by the Council and Assembly at the second meeting of the Assembly. Mr. Elihu Root, one of the most distinguished American jurists and statesmen, was a member of the Commission appointed by the League to frame the constitution of the Court, and John Basset Moore, another distinguished American

jurist, was elected a member of the Court. We may, therefore, hope to see the co-operation of the United States in the work of the new Court.

The establishment of a permanent Court of International Justice is a great practical step towards the establishment of 'public right' and the 'rule of law' among the nations, and is a very real contribution towards the cause of world peace and world stability. The Court is composed of judges of the highest standing for the determination of justiciable causes between nations on the basis of public right; to it all nations, small as well as great, may resort, in confidence that their causes will be determined not on the basis of either military or commercial strength or both, but on the very right and justice of their cause.

Disarma-
ment.

The movement for the limitation of armaments is not wholly modern, but I shall confine my references to the period since 1870 :

First: The effort put forth by Great Britain in the early part of 1870 at the request of France to induce Prussia to agree to a policy of disarmament and a limitation of armaments.

Secondly: The first Hague Peace Conference.

Thirdly: The provisions for disarmament in the Treaties of Peace and in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and

Fourthly: The present Disarmament Conference at Washington.

First: *Movement in 1870.* This was initiated by the Prime Minister of France with the British Ambassador in Paris. The following extract from a dispatch of Lord Lyons to Lord Clarendon, the British Foreign Secretary, explains the situation:

Lord Lyons to Lord Clarendon, 30th January 1870:

‘I have just had a visit from M. Emile Olliver and we have spoken confidentially on several subjects . . . He said he was very anxious that England should exert her influence with Prussia. He explained the position of the present French Ministers with regard to the subject. They depended, he said, principally on the great agricultural population of France for support against socialism and revolution; it was essential, therefore, that they should do something for that population. To conciliate them, either taxes might be remitted, or the call upon them for recruits be diminished. There were great difficulties in the way of remitting taxes, and when a reduction of the army was proposed the Ministers were met by the Emperor and the military party with the declaration that it would be unsafe to diminish the forces of France while those of Prussia were on their present footing. The effect would be that Prussia would make some attempt on Southern Germany and war would be the result . . . The time must come when France would be obliged to make a public proposal to Prussia to disarm; it was impossible that the French Government could assume, in the eyes of France and the world, any share of responsibility for the present exaggerated armaments and

expenses. They would be obliged to show the French people and the German people where the responsibility lay.' ¹

This has a strangely modern sound. Lord Clarendon took the matter up with Bismarck and several communications passed between London and Berlin, but all efforts to secure an understanding were without avail—Prussia was not prepared either to initiate a movement for disarmament or to be a party to it. Before the year closed Bismarck had brought on the Franco-Prussian War.

Secondly: *The first Hague Peace Conference*. Even so far back as 1899 the burden of military armaments had become so great that the first Peace Conference at the Hague was called on the initiation of the Czar of Russia to consider the question of the limitation of armaments. The Conference wholly failed to reach an agreement. Why did this and all previous efforts fail?

Germany declined to co-operate, and there was another and obvious difficulty in the way of any satisfactory or permanent agreement. So long as no reliable and available substitute for war as a means of settling international disputes existed, so long as nations felt that they might be compelled to resort to war to settle their disputes or to prevent aggression, each nation would insist

¹ Lord Lyons, *A Record of British Diplomacy*, by Lord Newton, Arnold, 1913, 2 vols., vol. i, pp. 248-50.

on determining the extent of its own armament and the military preparations which it would make. In addition, every nation knew and every nation knows to-day that even if an agreement were reached it would not stop the belligerency, it would only limit the military forces and armaments available at the outbreak of the war. Our experience in the last war shows that it would be only a question of time before the whole nation would be in arms and an adequate supply of armaments and munitions provided. We cannot permanently limit the armaments to be used in war or avert war itself, unless we provide a substitute for war as a means of settling disputes. The first Hague Peace Conference moved in the right direction when it made provision for the establishment of the Court of Arbitration.

Is the permanent limitation of armaments practicable? Yes, if certain essential conditions are complied with: Firstly—A reasonable alternative for war must be provided, an alternative open to all nations and to which all nations are under obligation to resort; Secondly—All the Great Powers must in the end be parties to the agreement and under obligation to carry it out; Thirdly—There must be some international organization or body responsible to the powers entrusted with the supervision of the execution of the agreement so as to ensure fair and honourable compliance with its terms. The League of

Nations is in a position to comply with all these conditions.

Thirdly : *The provisions for disarmament in the Treaties of Peace and in the Covenant of the League of Nations.* The movement for the limitation of armaments had already made substantial progress before the Washington Conference assembled. It took practical form in the Treaties of Peace with the former enemy States. In the introduction to the military, naval, and air clauses of the Treaty of Versailles the following statement appears : ' In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations, Germany undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval, and air clauses which follow.' The following clauses provide (1) for the disarmament of Germany, the delivery over or destruction of her military, naval, and air equipment, and the dismantling of her fortresses and fortifications ; (2) for limiting the number of her military, naval, and air forces to purely defensive purposes (her army must not exceed 100,000 men) ; (3) for the abolition of compulsory military service and the raising of any forces authorized under the Treaty by voluntary enlistment ; (4) that Germany cannot increase the forces authorized under the Treaty, unless with consent of the Council of the League of Nations ; and she agrees strictly to observe the decisions of the Council of the League on the subject.

Similar provisions are contained in the Treaties with all the former enemy States, and these provisions have been substantially executed, so that the insuperable barrier which the military armaments of the former enemy States presented to a general movement for world-wide disarmament has been removed. The existence and work of the League and the results already secured under the Treaties should make possible the success of the Washington Conference, without which the Conference could not succeed.

Work of
Council
and As-
sembly.

Since the League was formed the Council and the Assembly have been engaged in studying the problem of and preparing plans for a general limitation of armaments. While some real progress has been made, it was recognized that no final or permanent action could be taken without the co-operation of the United States. The League invited the co-operation of the United States in its work, but the Government of the United States could not see its way clear to accept the invitation. The United States has now invited the Great Powers, members of the League, to the Conference in Washington. They have accepted and the Conference is proceeding. If the work could not be done at Geneva, let it be done at Washington. It is the thing itself, not the place that is important.

Fourthly: *The Present Disarmament Conference at Washington.* The proposal of the United States

Government for an immediate reduction in naval strength by the three great naval Powers—the British Empire, the United States, and Japan—and for a naval holiday for ten years, has struck the imagination of the world, and the acceptance of this proposal, both in principle and spirit, by these Powers, assures the success of the Conference, so far as it relates to naval armaments. The proposal involves more than a great reduction in naval armaments and a naval holiday for ten years—it changes the whole basis of naval power throughout the world. We know the position the British Navy has held upon the seas. When the replacement scheme is completely executed the ratios of the British, American, and Japanese capital ships will be 5, 5, and 3. No nation has been asked to make so great a sacrifice of position as has Great Britain, and no nation could have made it more cheerfully. I shall refer to this proposal again when discussing the contribution of the British Empire to the cause of Peace.

The movement for the limitation of naval armaments is, however, only one step, though an important one, in the general movement for the limitation of armaments—it does not touch the real problem of Europe. It does not relieve the burdened and disorganized nations of Continental Europe of one dollar of national expenditure, nor of the withdrawal of their men from productive employment to military service; it does not aid

in the restoration of the state of peace in Continental Europe; that problem is still to be solved. Given Great Britain's co-operation, the limitation of naval armaments is a simple problem compared with the limitation of land and air armaments. There must be a corresponding limitation of land and air forces and an agreement or understanding that the United States will participate in some general workable plan for the preservation of peace before the objects of the Washington Conference can be fully realized.

We have all read with the deepest interest the statement of the Prime Minister of France at the Washington Conference. No one who recalls what France suffered during the war, and remembers the heroism of the French men and women throughout the war, can do otherwise than profoundly appreciate the service and sacrifice of France and the feeling of anxiety and apprehension in the minds of the French people as to the future, because France knows that unaided she is unable to meet a reorganized Germany. One key to M. Briand's speech is in the following paragraph: 'You might come and tell us, "This danger that you are exposed to, we see it; we realize it and we are going to share it with you; we are going to offer you all means, to put all means at your disposal in order to secure your safety"; and immediately, if we heard those words, we should hit upon another plan, we should be only too

France
and
Guaran-
tees.

pleased to demonstrate the sincerity of our purpose, but we understand the difficulties and necessities of the statesmen of other countries.' What has M. Briand in mind? When the war was over and the statesmen assembled in Paris to frame the Treaty of Peace, the military advisers of France, and in this they were supported by M. Clemenceau and the French Government, insisted that as security for France the Rhine should be the western boundary of Germany. They fought for weeks to secure such a provision in the Treaty of Peace. They asked that Germany west of the Rhine should be formed into an independent principality under international guarantees or the guarantee of the League of Nations, or in some way wholly detached from Germany, and that German sovereignty should not go west of the Rhine. Mr. Lloyd George and the whole British Empire delegation and Mr. Wilson and the whole American delegation were opposed, and rightly opposed, to that policy. Mr. Lloyd George is reported in M. Tardieu's book of *The Truth about the Treaty* as saying that this proposal would only create another Alsace and Lorraine, and that Great Britain could not and would not agree to it, and Mr. Wilson took the same position.¹ The French were so insistent on their point, however, that in order to meet, if possible, their view, and to assure them of the security to which they

¹ Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty*, 1921, pp. 171, 184.

felt they were entitled after all they had suffered, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George proposed to M. Clemenceau that, in lieu of making the Rhine the western boundary of Germany, and of the occupation of the Rhine provinces, the United States and Great Britain should each enter into a Treaty with France whereby they bound themselves, in case of unprovoked aggression by Germany on France, immediately to come to the assistance and relief of France. M. Tardieu says it was a very momentous proposal—neither the United States nor Great Britain had ever made such an unqualified proposal before to any nation—a proposal to bind themselves absolutely, by solemn treaty, to come to the assistance of another nation under such conditions. M. Clemenceau expressed his appreciation of the proposal, but after mature consideration declined to accept it in lieu of what he had proposed. His contention was that it was not sufficient, that there must be occupation of the territory west of the Rhine and the bridgeheads on the Rhine. But he finally agreed that occupation should be limited to fifteen years. He also wished some additional security in case, after the Treaty was signed with Germany, the Treaty of Guarantee should not be ratified. According to M. Tardieu,¹ he said to President Wilson :

“The Treaty, as it stands, satisfies me on the score of guarantees ; but the future belongs

¹ Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty*, 1921, p. 210.

neither to you nor to me. You have a Senate and I have a Parliament. We cannot be sure of what they will do ten years hence, or even of what they will do to-morrow. If, for example, the treaties with the United States and Great Britain were not ratified, what would be France's situation? What alternative guarantee would she have at her disposal?"

'President Wilson answered: "Your observation is perfectly just. But it raises a delicate question. Let us seek a solution."' "

The solution was found by adding the following clause to Article 428 of the Treaty, which provided for the occupation of the Rhine territory and the bridgeheads for fifteen years:

'If at that date the guarantees against unprovoked aggression by Germany are not considered sufficient by the Allied and Associated Governments, the evacuation of the occupying troops may be delayed to the extent regarded as necessary for the purpose of obtaining the required guarantees.'

On this basis the Treaty of Peace was finally settled and signed and the Treaties of Guarantee also signed. Each Treaty of Guarantee contains a provision that it only becomes effective in case the other is ratified.

The Treaty of Guarantee was submitted by the British Government to the House of Commons for approval. It is not customary to submit treaties to the House of Commons for approval, but this was of such a special character that it

was submitted to the House of Commons. The House approved, and the British Government stood ready to ratify it. The United States Treaty of Guarantee has not been approved by the Senate, so that the British Treaty of Guarantee has not gone into effect and France is without her guarantees.

It may not be without interest to point out that when Great Britain became a party to that Treaty Canada was called upon to consider whether she, as part of the British Empire, should become a party to it also. It was a very serious question which required most careful consideration; it involved the question of committing Canada to an obligation of a very grave character such as she had never entered into before. It was finally decided that the form of this Guarantee Treaty should differ from the others. In all the other treaties His Majesty, representing the British Empire as a whole, is the party and all the Dominions signed and are bound by the ratification subsequently deposited with their approval. In the Treaty of Guarantee there is an express provision that the Dominions shall not be bound except by their express consent—and Canada has not so far given her consent. This Treaty has, therefore, not been submitted to the Canadian Parliament, and Canada is not at present a party to it. Although this special Treaty of Guarantee was not ratified France retained the benefit of the

guarantees contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Under Article 10, already referred to, the members agree to preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the members of the League. If the United States had entered the League, as France expected, she would have had the benefit of this covenant also on the part of the United States. France, through her Prime Minister at Washington, has said in effect: 'We signed the Treaty, we made peace, relying upon certain guarantees for protection. These guarantees are not forthcoming, then do not ask us to disarm, for we must protect ourselves, we must depend on ourselves, and under these conditions we cannot join in a general plan for limitation of land armaments.' That appears to be the present position so far as France is concerned. We can understand and appreciate the feelings of France, but unless France disarms other nations will not. The speech of M. Briand proposes no solution of the problem and offers little hope for the future. It raises one of the gravest questions in the international situation to-day, and, unless some kind of solution is found, the real burden of military armaments so far as the world is concerned will not be seriously dealt with. All must earnestly hope and pray that some solution will be found at Washington. Washington may succeed, will succeed, in the limitation of naval

armaments, but, unless the Conference goes further and deals with the limitation of land and air forces, and goes still further and reaches an agreement for the preservation of peace to which the United States is a party, the world will not be freed from the menace and intolerable burden of huge land armaments or of the possibility of future wars. The eyes of the world are on Washington, and humanity prays for the complete success of the Conference.

While several political questions have been referred to the League for settlement, I shall only mention three: the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia, and Serbia and Albania.

Political
Questions.

1. The Aaland Islands dispute gives an excellent illustration of the practical benefits of the League organization. An acute dispute arose between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands. These islands had been politically united to Finland for over a hundred years, but the population was predominantly Swedish and, applying the principle of self-determination, they voted by a large majority to join Sweden. Finland, however, would not let them go. This dispute, involving questions of race and language, was of the very character to inflame national sentiment and provoke war. Sweden and Finland were drifting apart, were drifting toward a serious international situation. Under the Covenant of the League of Nations war or the threat of war in any part of

The
Aaland
Islands.

the world becomes a matter of concern to every member of the League, and any member may bring it to the attention of the Council.¹ Great Britain, in the interests of world peace, brought the dispute between Finland and Sweden to the attention of the Council of the League. The Council investigated and settled the question, possibly not entirely to the satisfaction of either Sweden or Finland, but settled it in a way the Council of the League considered just, and thus removed the danger of war between these two States. The decision of the Council included the following matters of principle :

1. The sovereignty of the Aaland Islands is recognized to belong to Finland.

2. Nevertheless, the interests of the world, the future of cordial relations between Finland and Sweden, the prosperity and happiness of the Islands themselves cannot be ensured unless (a) certain further guarantees are given for the protection of the Islanders ; and unless (b) arrangements are concluded for the non-fortification and neutralization of the Archipelago.

Suitable provision was made for giving effect to these principles.

Silesia.

2. *Upper Silesia.* The Commission appointed by the Peace Conference at Paris to delimit the frontiers of the new State of Poland recommended that Upper Silesia should form a part of Poland on the so-called principle of self-determination,

¹ Article 11 of the Covenant.

the Commission being of the opinion that a very substantial majority of the inhabitants of the territory were Polish and would prefer Polish sovereignty. The recommendation of the Committee was approved by the Supreme Council and was embodied in the draft Treaty submitted to Germany. Against this proposal Germany entered a most vehement protest and maintained there was nothing to justify the allotment to Poland of Upper Silesia: ‘(a) because there had been no connexion between Upper Silesia and the Polish Kingdom since 1163: Poland, therefore, could not lay any legal claim to the country; (b) because Upper Silesia was not inhabited by a population which was indisputably Polish; and (c) because the development of the country was due entirely to Germany, who could not, from an economic point of view, do without the territory, whereas Poland would have no need of it; without Upper Silesia Germany could not fulfil its obligations and the peace of the world would be in danger.’ The German Government also contended that separation from Germany was not in accordance with the wishes or interests of the population.

To appreciate Germany’s position it is necessary to recall that under the Treaty of Peace Germany was restoring, and properly restoring, Alsace and Lorraine to France, with their great mineral deposits and their important industrial areas. The rich coal mines of the Saar basin were also

ceded to France in full and absolute possession, and Germany renounced in favour of the League of Nations, as Trustee, the government of the Saar territory. It was provided in the Treaty that at the end of fifteen years the inhabitants should be called upon to indicate the sovereignty under which they desired to be placed. Under the Treaty Germany also recognized the independence of Poland and renounced in her favour all her rights to the territories which Germany had acquired as a result of the partition of Poland. But Upper Silesia was different. It had been German territory for nearly a thousand years. It appeared that before the war it had produced twenty-three per cent. of Germany's annual output of coal—three times as much as the Saar basin; it also furnished eighty-one per cent. of her lead and a very large part of her steel and iron products, and Germany could not see any just ground for relinquishing her title to it.

Mr. Lloyd George recognized the force of the German contention, and on his initiative the question was reconsidered by the Supreme Council and a new clause inserted in the Treaty which provided that the inhabitants of Upper Silesia should indicate by a vote whether they wished to be attached to Germany or to Poland, and that, pending the taking of the plebiscite, the territory should be administered by an International Commission composed of representatives

of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy.

The Treaty also provided that on the conclusion of the voting the number of votes cast in each commune should be communicated by the Commission to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, with a full report as to the taking of the vote and a recommendation as to the line which ought to be adopted as the frontier of Germany in Upper Silesia, and that in this recommendation regard should be paid to the wishes of the inhabitants as shown by the vote, and to the geographical and economic conditions of the locality. The plebiscite was held on the 20th March 1921, and resulted in a substantial majority in favour of Upper Silesia remaining attached to Germany. In many of the communes, however, there were very large Polish majorities. In the industrial district, the most vital part of the territory, the vote in the urban centres was largely in favour of Germany, whereas in rural communes surrounding many of these industrial centres there was a substantial Polish majority.

When the International Commission endeavoured to frame a recommendation as to the line which ought to be adopted as the frontier of Germany in Upper Silesia, serious differences of opinion developed, with the result that the Commission was unable to agree upon a report. In the meantime a Polish insurrection broke out which compelled

the British Prime Minister to use very strong language with reference to the attitude of Poland in the matter, and the Supreme Council found it necessary to send substantial reinforcements of Allied troops to restore and preserve order as between the Poles and the Germans.

As the International Commission made no recommendation, it remained for the Supreme Council to reach a decision. It was at once evident that the same differences of opinion which prevented the International Commission from making a recommendation divided the members of the Supreme Council. A series of meetings of the Council failed to reach a solution—the broad line of cleavage was as to what portion should be allotted to Poland. France proposed a boundary which would have allotted to Poland industrial areas which Germany contended, and Great Britain believed, were vital to the industrial life of Germany and to the peace of Europe. Great Britain and Italy were unwilling, therefore, to accept this solution; on the other hand, France was unwilling to accept the boundary proposed by Great Britain, as she contended it gave Germany too much territory and was not fair to the Poles. Each contended that the solution proposed was in accordance with the terms of the Treaty, and each was strongly supported by national opinion in the position taken. Great Britain and France, whose co-operation throughout the

war had made possible the victory secured, found themselves unable to agree upon a solution of this grave question, and the relations between them were seriously strained. Neither was prepared to recede from the position taken, but each could, with honour, agree to refer the matter to the Council of the League and to abide by its decisions.

On the suggestion of Mr. Lloyd George the Supreme Council decided :

‘ In pursuance of Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to submit to the Council of the League the difficulty attending the fixing of the frontier between Germany and Poland in Upper Silesia, and to invite the recommendation of the Council as to the line which the Principal Allied and Associated Powers should lay down.’

Paragraph 2 of Article 11 reads as follows :

‘ It is declared to be the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.’

The Council undertook the task, and committed the investigation of the question to the members of the Council who were not members of the Supreme Council, viz.—Belgium, Brazil, China, and Spain. As a result of this investigation the Council reached a unanimous agreement as to the solution of the difficulty.

The Council decided that it was their duty 'to find a solution in conformity with the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the plebiscite, while taking into account the geographical and economic situation of the various districts', and they recommended a division of the industrial region of Upper Silesia. They also recommended, and this recommendation formed part of their proposed solution, that measures should be taken 'to guarantee, during a provisional period of readjustment, the continuity of the economic life of this region, which, owing to the density of its population, the number of its industrial undertakings, the closely-woven network of its means of communication, possesses the character of a vast agglomeration'. They were also of the opinion that it would be desirable to provide for the protection of minorities. The Council's recommendation contained suitable provisions for giving effect to their recommendations.

The recommendation of the Council, adopted on the 12th October 1921, was immediately approved by the Supreme Council, which alone, under the terms of the Treaty, could finally determine the frontier. Both Germany and Poland were dissatisfied with the decision. There may not be complete agreement as to the solution recommended by the Council of the League—it is not possible that there should be complete agreement in the settlement of any question so intricate and

difficult—but the result is that war between Germany and Poland was averted and co-operation between Great Britain and France was preserved and with it the general measure of European peace which now prevails. If the League had rendered no other service to the cause of world peace, it would have more than justified its existence.

3. *Serbia and Albania.* Albania is inhabited by Albania.
a distinct Albanian race speaking a common language, a race ardently attached to the home of their ancestors. By the Treaty of London, 1913, between Turkey and the Balkan States, provision was made for the creation of an independent Albania. Its constitution and its extent were reserved for the consideration of the Great Powers, and at a conference of Ambassadors in 1914 the independence of Albania was recognized under the guarantee of the Great Powers and its frontiers were drawn on a map, but prior to the war they had not been delimited on the ground. A government was organized under the new constitution.

By the secret Treaty of London, 1915, between Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia, under which Italy entered the war, the partition of Albania and an Italian Protectorate over the remainder were contemplated. The whole territory was occupied during the war by the forces of France, Italy, and Austria, and the country was administered as occupied territory. When

the military occupation ceased the Albanian people reorganized their government and Albania applied for admission to the League of Nations at the first Assembly, 1920. In the meantime Italy had renounced all claims to a protectorate. Albania's admission was opposed by her neighbours, Greece and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. It was claimed that her boundaries had never been settled, that the secret Treaty of London had put an end to her national existence, if ever she had one, and that she had not been recognized and was not then recognized *de iure* by the Powers, and should not, therefore, be admitted to the League.

The Committee on the admission of new States reported against her application, but the Assembly reversed this report and admitted her. It was obvious that the Assembly did not feel disposed to recognize the secret Treaty of London as destroying the integrity or independence of Albania, nor to leave struggling Albania to the mercy of her Balkan neighbours, all of whom were members of the League. They, therefore, determined to give Albania the protection of the League by admitting her to membership, and they left it to the Council of Ambassadors to complete the delimitation of her boundaries. The Council delayed its decision, and, in the meantime, the aggressive intention of the Serbs manifested itself by an invasion of admittedly

Albanian territory. This invasion took place just as the second meeting of the Assembly was drawing to a close, and the Assembly urged the Council of Ambassadors to complete the work of delimiting the boundaries without further delay, and requested the sending of a mission representing the League to adjust matters on the ground. Under this pressure the Council of Ambassadors completed their work and announced their decision, which Albania accepted; but the Serbs did not desist from their military activities. There were in the situation all the elements of another Balkan conflagration. Great Britain, just as she did in the case of the Aaland Islands, brought the matter to the attention of the Council of the League and requested an immediate meeting to consider the situation. I quote the telegram from Mr. Lloyd George to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as illustrating the simple and convenient procedure which the League provides for dealing with questions which arise under Article 16 of the Covenant:

‘Continued advance of Jugo-Slav forces into Albania being of nature to disturb international peace His Majesty’s Government desire to call the attention of the Council thereto and request that you will take immediate steps to summon meeting of the Council to consider situation and to agree upon measures to be taken under Article 16 in the event of the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government refusing or delaying to execute their obligations

under the Covenant. Ambassadors' Conference have now decided frontiers of Albania which will at once be notified to interested parties. (S.) D. Lloyd George.'

It was only a matter of a few days before the meeting was held and it was plainly intimated to Jugo-Slavia that she must withdraw her forces and respect the integrity of Albania, which she had covenanted to do as a member of the League. This she is now proceeding to do.

Contrast this simple, expeditious, and effective method of securing investigation and action in the Balkan trouble of 1921 with the heroic, persistent, but futile efforts of Viscount Grey to secure similar action in the Balkan trouble of 1914, and we have a measure of the League's service to the cause of peace and humanity.

In the light of the prompt action in the Serbo-Albanian trouble of 1921, one is better able to appreciate the statement of Mr. Lloyd George that, had such an organization as the League existed in 1914, the World War might have been averted and humanity saved all the loss and suffering which ensued. Let those who oppose or withhold support from the League propose some better and more practical method for dealing with such problems, a method which all nations can accept, and humanity will listen to them. But if they have no practical proposal to make to suffering and discouraged humanity, preferring the part of

the priest or the Levite and passing by on the other side, let them throw no stones as they pass at the heads of those who are courageously and honestly trying to improve the situation.

The case of Albania illustrates two or three facts of outstanding importance from the standpoint of world peace. First: That the League stands for the protection of small nations against the aggressive intentions of their stronger neighbours. The League, by admitting Albania to membership, thereby ensured her independence and integrity. Secondly: That the League provides the machinery to investigate any dispute between nations anywhere which threatens the peace of the world, and possesses the authority to put a stop to the aggressive purposes of a warlike member. Thirdly: The whole issue can be thoroughly ventilated in public, and, in addition to any measures the League may take, the public opinion of the world can be brought to bear against the offending nation. These considerations mark a new era in international relations.

Dr. Benès, the present Prime Minister of Czecho-Slovakia, has made an important proposal for the amendment of the Covenant, which is deserving of most careful consideration. He proposed that the Covenant should be amended so as to provide for 'Regional Conferences' of members of the League interested in particular questions. A good illustration of such a Regional Conference

Regional
Confer-
ences.

is that now being held in Washington on Pacific problems, attended only by the Powers specially interested in the questions. The Committee on Amendments to the Covenant reported in favour of Dr. Benès' proposal, but the second Assembly was averse to amending the Covenant at the present time, and it was suggested that these Conferences might be held under the League as now constituted. The proposal is a most valuable one and foreshadows an important development in the organization and work of the League. All nations are not directly interested in all questions that come up for consideration and all nations cannot attend all the meetings necessary to consider all questions. The development of the idea of Regional Conferences under the general supervision of the League should make for expedition and efficiency, and avoid the necessity of dealing with matters of only regional interest in the Assembly.

The
League
should
include
all
nations.

It was not the original design that the League should be composed of a group of nations and that another group should remain outside. The League can never achieve fully the high purpose for which it was formed unless it includes in its membership all the principal Powers. So long as Germany, Russia, and the United States remain outside, there is no assurance of permanent peace. From all the information available we cannot doubt that Germany is ready to enter, in fact, is anxious to

be admitted, but she will not apply until she knows she will be received. May I express the hope that another meeting of the Assembly will not close without Germany being admitted? Russia must determine her own form of government, and if she decides to maintain the Soviet form of government or establishes any other form, and applies to be admitted, and is prepared to comply with the conditions, she should be admitted also. Undoubtedly the abstention of the United States from the League has seriously delayed the return of peace and of stability. As already pointed out, the United States has been a leader in the great movement for the peaceable settlement of international disputes. Her people love peace and hate war. At present the difference seems to be one of method rather than of principle, and if the principal Powers whose objectives are peace are able to maintain co-operation with the United States in international affairs, in time they should be able to agree upon methods.

I have already pointed out that the two greatest problems facing the world to-day are (1) what form of international co-operation can be introduced to supplement the Nation-State in the political organization of society, and (2) what just and honourable method can be devised to take the place of force in settling disputes between nations. In view of the facts of history and the experience

of the past seven years, does not the League of Nations provide an answer to both of these questions? If the League is rejected, what is the alternative?

What should be the attitude of the peoples toward the League? They must stand by it. Even if it has not rendered as great service as some hoped, it has more than justified its existence and is full of promise for the future. If the Covenant is not wholly satisfactory, it can be amended. If the Council is not as strong as it should be, and many think it is not, it can be strengthened. The Council should command the attendance of the statesmen who attend the meetings of the Supreme Council, for if they can find time to attend meetings of the Supreme Council to settle matters arising under the Treaties of Peace, they surely can find time to attend meetings to avert a repetition of the horrors of war. If the Assembly is not as strong in its personnel as it should be, it can be made still more influential by the character of the delegates whom the nations send to it, but the strength of both the Council and of the Assembly will depend upon the public opinion of the world. The future of the League is in the hands of the people of all nations. They know the cost and the horrors of war, and to the masses in every land, to the women and to the children, the League comes with a message of hope and of deliverance.

PART II

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER IV

THE EMPIRE'S PLACE AMONG THE NATIONS

THE history of the expansion and development of the island kingdom of Great Britain, constituted by the union of the British and Scottish Crowns in 1603,¹ covering an area of 88,000 square miles and containing a total population of less than 7,000,000, into the Britannic Commonwealth of to-day, composed of a group of free, self-governing sovereign States and India, united under a common Sovereign, covering more than one-fourth of the earth's surface and containing approximately one-fourth of the world's population, is a story of absorbing interest. Some may not approve of every step taken in the course of this expansion and development; the British people were not supermen, they were like other men of their age, governed by the same emotions, moved by the same passions. Our task is neither to justify nor to blame, but to deal with the facts as we find them.

The
Britannic
Common-
wealth.

¹ Legislative Union was effected under the Act of Union, 1707.

The only phase of this expansion and development with which we are concerned at this time is its relation to World Peace. To appreciate this, we must consider the world-wide and strategic disposition of the territories of the Commonwealth, the character and state of civilization of its peoples, the different forms of government under which they severally live, and the methods of co-operation in process of development, whereby the nations of the Commonwealth can act together in Imperial and international affairs.

Of the self-governing nations, the United Kingdom and Canada are in the Northern Hemisphere ; Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa in the Southern. These, with India, are the pillars upon which the Commonwealth rests. The territories of the Commonwealth are to be found on every continent and amid the almost countless islands of the seas. The United Kingdom is on the east side of the North Atlantic, Canada and Newfoundland are on the west ; the British West African territories and the Union of South Africa are on the east side of the South Atlantic, and the British West Indies are on the west, almost midway between the north and south. Gibraltar stands at the entrance to the Mediterranean ; the Suez Canal controls the outlet and the waterway to India and the East ; while Egypt, Palestine, and Aden control the approaches to the Canal. The British East African territories and the Union

of South Africa are on the west of the Indian Ocean ; India is on the north ; and Australia and New Zealand are on the east. Australia and New Zealand are on the west of the South Pacific, and Canada and Hong Kong on the east and west, respectively, of the North Pacific.

Great though the Empire is in extent, it is greater still in trade. As the land of the Empire is about equally divided between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, there is a balance between the summer products of one-half and the winter season of the other, which is of great advantage to trade. In the year 1913-14 the total trade of the world amounted to £6,928,000,000. Of this great sum the trade of the Commonwealth amounted to £2,504,000,000, or over 36 per cent. It is interesting to contrast this volume of trade with the £5,000,000 of the year 1603. On the 30th of June 1914, 42 per cent. of the world's steam shipping was under the British flag, while in that same year there was launched in shipyards within the Empire one and a half times as much tonnage as was launched in all the rest of the world.¹

The highways connecting the members of the Commonwealth are upon the high seas, and the mercantile marine of the British peoples supplies the place of railways and roads upon the land, and provides the means of transportation essential to

¹ 1,730,000 tons as compared with 1,122,000 tons.

government and to free intercourse and trade between all portions of the Commonwealth.

To police and protect these highways, to keep open these trade routes, and to aid in the preservation of peace so essential to the continued progress and development of the Commonwealth, the British Navy has been developed and maintained. The freedom of the seas is essential to the life of the Commonwealth.

Extent
and Mem-
bership.

The peoples of the Commonwealth represent all the great races, all the great world religions, and all degrees of civilization, from the untutored native of Central Africa to the most cultivated citizen of London, Edinburgh, Dublin—or may not one add Toronto? It has been said, and truly said, that if a cross-section is taken of the races of humanity, a British subject will be found in every layer. Every fourth man in the world lives and sleeps under the British flag. Of this vast population 62,000,000 are white and 378,000,000 coloured or black. Of Christians of all shades of faith there are some 65,000,000; of Hindus, 218,000,000; of Moslems, 93,000,000; and of other faiths some 65,000,000. Amid all this diversity of religious faith, none may persecute his neighbour for his religious belief, and every man has liberty to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. There is no question affecting race or religion or the relation of the more advanced races to the more backward

—questions that go to the very basis of democracy and international peace—which has not arisen and is not arising among the peoples of the Commonwealth and with which statesmen of the Commonwealth have not been called upon and will not be called upon to deal. By long experience they have acquired both the habit and the spirit of toleration and of just treatment.

Even this incomplete enumeration of the territories of the Britannic Commonwealth, of their geographical location, of the volume of their trade, and of the diversity in race and religion of their peoples, shows that any disturbance of the peace in any quarter of the globe is a matter of immediate concern to some part of the Britannic Commonwealth and directly or indirectly affects the whole, and that no peoples have such a deep and vital concern in the preservation of the world's peace or can make so great a contribution toward it as the Britannic peoples. The Commonwealth is no world in miniature; it is a world in itself, the good governance of which and the stability of which affect all the world.

CHAPTER V

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BRITISH STATE

The Em-
pire's
contribu-
tion to
peace.

JUST as peace in the local community is promoted by each family preserving peace among its own members and an attitude of friendly co-operation toward all its neighbours, so peace in the family of nations is promoted by each member preserving peace within its own borders and an attitude of friendly co-operation toward all other members. What is the solid basis upon which both domestic and international peace must finally rest ? (1) Liberty assured by law ; (2) Justice honestly and impartially administered ; and (3) The spirit and practice of genuine co-operation. These largely depend upon the form and spirit of government.

What has been the contribution of the Britannic Commonwealth to World Peace, and what will be the contribution in the future ? For convenience of discussion the question may be considered under three aspects :

- I. Britain's contribution to World Peace in the sphere of internal government.
- II. Britain's contribution to World Peace in the sphere of Empire.
- III. The Empire's contribution to World Peace in the International sphere.

Britain's contribution to peace in the sphere of internal government may be considered from two points of view : first, the rights conferred upon the individual citizen ; secondly, the political organization of the State.

The individual citizen.

First, as to the individual : Magna Charta, signed in 1215, some five hundred and eighty years before the French Revolution, is the corner-stone on which has been reared our modern structure of free and liberal institutions. Magna Charta established the 'rule of Law' as opposed to that of arbitrary power. Under it life, liberty, and property were protected from arbitrary spoliation, and none was to be condemned to forfeit these but by the lawful judgement of his peers or the law of the land. By the 'rule of Law' we mean the absolute supremacy or predominance of regular law as opposed to the influence or use of arbitrary power. British subjects are 'ruled by the law and by law alone ; a man with us can be punished for a breach of the law, but he can be punished for nothing else'.¹ It also means 'equality before the law', or the equality or subjection of all classes to the ordinary law of the land administered by the ordinary law courts. The rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, are all judged by the same law. The 'rule of Law', as now developed in the British system, carries with it the guaranty of individual liberty, including freedom of speech,

¹ Dicey, *The Law of the Constitution* (1902), p. 198.

freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. The 'rule of Law' so characteristic of the Britannic system is well illustrated by the celebrated case of *Mostyn v. Fabrigas*.¹

In 1771 Lieutenant-General Mostyn, Governor of Minorca, which had recently been ceded to Great Britain, arrested one Fabrigas, a native of the place, who had been implicated in a riot and was endeavouring to stir up a mutiny, and transported him to Spain without the form of trial. Fabrigas went to London and brought action for arrest and false imprisonment against the Governor, and was given a verdict of £3,000 by the jury. General Mostyn thereupon brought a Writ of Error in the King's Bench, but the judgement of the Court of Common Pleas was affirmed, Lord Mansfield saying, 'To lay down in an English Court of Justice such a monstrous proposition as that a Governor, acting by virtue of letters patent under the Great Seal, can do what he pleases; that he is accountable only to God and his own conscience; and that he is absolutely despotic and that he may spoil, plunder, affect their bodies and their liberty, and is accountable to nobody—is a doctrine not to be maintained; for if he is not accountable to this Court, he is accountable nowhere.'²

Repre-
sentative
Govern-
ment.

Secondly, as to the political organization of the State. The distinguishing characteristic of the

¹ (1774) 20 How. St. Tr. 81; 1 Cowp. 161; 1 S. L. C. (1903), p. 591.

² 20 How. St. Tr., p. 231.

British constitutional system is the unlimited sovereignty of Parliament, which means the political sovereignty of the people, and the advantages of this system as compared with that of Germany and the United States was never more clearly demonstrated than during the late war.

It is to the British peoples that we owe the development and firm establishment of both representative and responsible government. While representative government may have been discovered and practised in Spain before its adoption in England, there can be no question that it was the British people who worked out the system on practical lines, and it is, therefore, not surprising that they are generally credited with its discovery. As a result of the efforts of the British people a representative Parliament was established at Westminster, which has become the mother of Parliaments throughout the world. The successful establishment of representative government has made democracy as a form of government possible and changed the whole course of modern history.

The British system of Parliamentary Government differs fundamentally from that which prevailed in Germany before the War, and from that which prevails in the United States to-day. Under the British system there is not only representative government, there is also responsible government, that is to say, the Execu-

tive is responsible to the representative Chamber. Under the German system the Executive was not responsible to the representative Chamber, and a military autocracy, surrounding a ruler who claimed to rule by Divine Right, plunged the world into war. In the United States an Executive not responsible to or possessing the confidence of the representative Chambers was unable to make peace, with consequences most unfortunate to the world. Our parliamentary system saves us from both extremes and both difficulties ; it ensures the concurrence of Parliament, both in making war and in making peace. Those who had occasion to deal with the British or the Canadian Governments and the Government of the United States during the last war must have been struck by the much greater freedom of action which the British system provided, while at the same time maintaining full responsibility to Parliament and to the people.

There is another feature in which the British system differed fundamentally from the German and from certain other pre-war systems of government, that is, the assured supremacy of the civil over the military power. There are, no doubt, militarists in Great Britain, as there are in every country, men who believe that 'might makes right', and that the sword is the best weapon to settle disputes between nations, but under the British system they can never gain the upper

hand or drive the nation into war. The Parliament of Great Britain retains absolute control over the Executive in the matter of a standing army. The number of troops which may be maintained by the Executive is strictly limited by statute, and the right to maintain this army in times of peace is granted for only one year at a time. So resolute are the British people to retain the control of the civil over the military power that the Army Act must be renewed every year. Even the limited force maintained must be raised by voluntary enlistment. The British Government cannot raise its army in time of peace by conscription. This complete control of the civil power absolutely prevents the domination of the military class and averts the possibility of their pushing the country into war.

CHAPTER VI

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Govern-
ment
of the
Common-
wealth.

HISTORY bears testimony to the number of wars which have had their origin in the dissatisfaction of the governed with the political institutions under which they lived. Any form of government which ensures justice and liberty and which brings peace and contentment to the people is a very real contribution to World Peace. The British Commonwealth secures these results for one-fourth of the world's population. What are the characteristic features of the Commonwealth which contribute to these beneficent results ?

One of the most notable and characteristic features of the constitution of the Commonwealth is the unique and indispensable place of the Sovereign in all legislative and administrative Acts. The King is an essential part of every sovereign legislative body in the Commonwealth. Under our Canadian constitution the Parliament of Canada consists of the King, the Senate, and the House of Commons, and the concurrence of all three is essential to the validity of every legislative Act. His Majesty is just as truly King of Canada and of the other Dominions as he is of Great Britain and Ireland.

But in the sphere of government the Sovereign acts only upon the advice of his constitutional advisers responsible to Parliament. In Great Britain, therefore, the King acts upon the advice of a ministry responsible to the British Parliament ; in Canada on the advice of a ministry responsible to the Canadian Parliament, and similarly in all the self-governing Dominions. It is the same Sovereign who acts throughout the entire Empire, but he acts, and acts only in conformity with the will of the people as expressed through their elected representatives in Parliament, in all the several self-governing States of the Empire. In the portions of the Empire which are not self-governing, or in so far as not self-governing, the Sovereign acts upon the advice of the British Ministers. It is this unique relation of the Crown to all the self-governing members of the Commonwealth which makes possible their full equality of status under a common Sovereign, and which enables the other States to advance along the path of self-government as rapidly as they prove their capacity for self-government, without any violent constitutional change. The only change required is that, to the extent to which any State is granted responsible self-government, the Sovereign should cease to act upon the advice of his British Ministers and act upon the advice of Ministers responsible to the legislative body of that State. In form the change appears small ; in effect it is fundamental.

Under our Federal Constitution in Canada we have an excellent illustration of the practical operation of this constitutional principle. The Dominion Parliament is supreme within its legislative sphere and the Provincial Legislatures are also supreme within the limits prescribed by the British North America Act. His Majesty in the Dominion sphere acts upon the advice of his Dominion Ministers, while in the Provincial sphere he acts upon the advice of his Provincial Ministers.

It is because the Sovereign occupies this commanding place in the constitution of the Commonwealth above the strife of parties or the sectional interests of any one portion of the Empire that he constitutes the centre of unity for the whole, and all the peoples of the Empire unite in cheerful allegiance and loyal devotion to him.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the constitution of the Commonwealth at the present time is the absence of any Central Parliament and Executive exercising jurisdiction over the whole Empire. Common action where required is secured by consultation and agreement between its several members. The Imperial Parliament is still the repository of the legislative power for the whole Empire, but in respect of the Dominions it is a custodian of this power for them ; and by constitutional custom it only exercises this power at their request. These requests are made from time to time when the Dominions desire amend-

ments to their constitutions. The Parliament of Canada, for example, has requested these amendments on a number of occasions and the supreme legislative power has been exercised in compliance with these requests.

Methods of consultation between members of the Commonwealth have been in process of development for nearly half a century and the final stage has not yet been reached. It was in view of the growing status of the Dominions and in recognition of the need for consultation that Lord Salisbury in 1887 called the first Colonial Conference composed of representatives of the self-governing Colonies and the Motherland which met in London at the time of the Queen's Jubilee. His opening address to the Conference was prophetic :

‘ We all feel the gravity and the importance of this occasion. The decisions of this Conference may not be, for the moment, of vital importance ; the business may seem prosaic, and may not issue in any great results at the moment. But we are all sensible that this meeting is the beginning of a state of things which is to have great results in the future. It will be the parent of a long progeniture, and distant Councils of the Empire may, in some far-off time, look back to the meeting in this room as the root from which all their greatness and all their beneficence sprang. . . .

‘ I have now only to repeat with how much pleasure we see this meeting, which indicates a drawing closer and closer of those bonds which have been created by a common origin, a common

First
Colonial
Confer-
ence.

history, and a common allegiance. We hope that connexion may become more and more true and real, and that we may by our organization and by our agreement present to the world the spectacle of a vast Empire, founded not upon force and upon subjection, but upon hearty sympathy, and a resolute co-operation in attaining those high objects of human endeavour which are open to an Empire like this.' ¹

In 1907 the Colonial Conference developed into the Imperial Conference with its permanent secretariat and its fixed periods for meeting. In 1917, in order to deal more effectively with certain problems relating to the immediate prosecution of the War which affected the whole Empire, the Imperial War Cabinet was called into existence, composed of the members of the Imperial Government directly concerned with the conduct of the war, and the Prime Minister and one colleague from each of the self-governing Dominions, and two representatives from India. The Imperial Conference which met at the same time each year dealt with all other matters requiring common or joint action.

With the conclusion of peace the Imperial War Cabinet passed out of existence, but the Conference of Prime Ministers and representatives held in London in June and July 1921 carried on the work which the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial Conference had performed in previous years.

¹ *Proceedings of the Colonial Conference* (1887), C. 5091, pp. 5-7.

During the period covered by these several Conferences there was developed an ever-increasing volume of correspondence between the Imperial and Dominion Governments in reference to matters of common concern, and communications by cable and dispatch have become a recognized method of consultation. No one questions that there are practical difficulties in the way of maintaining continuous or practically continuous consultation between the widely-separated members of the Commonwealth, but the necessity for such consultation cannot be denied. Its great practical benefits are obvious, and from the experiments already tried and the experience already gained suitable and feasible methods will be developed to meet the exigencies of the situation. In the next lecture I shall refer to some proposals for improving our methods of consultation.

A third characteristic of the Commonwealth is the legislative and administrative freedom of its several self-governing members.

The self-governing
Dominions.

While, as will appear in the next lecture, colonial self-government was largely the discovery and work of the statesmen in what were then called the Colonies, yet once that principle was established, its application by the British people to the government of overseas possessions has been one of their truly great achievements in the science of government, and one of their truly great contributions to World Peace. It is this discovery which

has enabled 'autonomy to be reconciled with unity'. It was the failure to make this discovery before the American Revolution which led to the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race. Colonial self-government as illustrated in the constitutions of the Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Newfoundland, is fundamental to the existence of the Commonwealth. Where can one find anything finer in British history than the action of the Government of the late Henry Campbell-Bannerman in giving responsible self-government to the Boer Colonies of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State within four years after the termination of the South African War? It is the principle of liberty and self-government thus so strikingly illustrated which distinguishes the British Empire from all which have preceded it, and never have liberty and self-government borne richer fruit in loyalty and service than that which the Commonwealth received from South Africa under the brilliant leadership of General Botha throughout the trying days of the World War. His untimely death was a great loss to the whole Commonwealth.

The complete freedom of the self-governing members has not destroyed the sense of unity of the whole. No one who followed the proceedings of the Imperial War Conference and the Imperial War Cabinet during the war and the negotiations for peace could doubt for one moment the essential

unity of the Commonwealth. We all recall the dark days of the Spring and early Summer of 1918, when the tide of war appeared for a time to have turned decisively in favour of Germany, and German submarines were taking their weekly toll of British and Allied shipping. It was during the darkest days of the conflict—thanks to the courage and resource of the British Navy—that the representatives of the Commonwealth gathered around the common council table in London and there planned for still greater efforts and still greater unity to defeat the common foe. The Empire founded upon freedom, and so loosely knit together that Germany thought that with the first shock of war it would fall to pieces, was never so united and never so formidable as when passing through the common ordeal of suffering and of sacrifice. It was a united Commonwealth which made victory possible and saved civilization. We stood together amid all the shocks of war ; we shall stand together in the calmer and happier days of peace.

Still another characteristic is the diversity in forms of government throughout the Commonwealth. Almost all forms of government are to be found, from the direct, personal government of the British representatives over certain native tribes in Africa, to the free, responsible, self-governing democracies of the United Kingdom and the Dominions. To these have now been added the administration of mandated territories under the

League of Nations, the forms of the mandates varying according to the character and stage of development of the people in each territory. A characteristic of all these forms of government is that no matter what may be the degree of political development of the people or the form of government for the time being, justice is honestly and impartially administered, life and property are protected, and the citizen is secured in the enjoyment of his civil and political rights.

The principle underlying this diversity in forms of government is that the form of government should be adapted to the conditions, needs, and stage of political development of the people in each particular State or territory. This is fundamental. Neither British nor Dominion statesmen have been carried away by theories of government, which, however applicable to certain peoples at certain stages of political development, may be wholly inapplicable to other peoples at other stages of political development. The United States stands for a certain theory of government which in practice she is unable to apply, and does not apply to a large section of her population. France stands for a certain theory of government which in practice she is unable to apply, and does not apply to her non-European territories and to non-European races.

At no period in the history of the Commonwealth have there been so many striking illustrations of

the settled policy of endeavouring to adapt the form of government to the conditions, needs, and stage of political development of the people as to-day.

IRELAND

The Irish problem in its broad outlines has been so frequently stated and discussed that I shall not attempt to enter upon a discussion of the question here; but there can be no doubt that the problem of the government of Ireland is one of the most urgent and important which the Empire is facing. The situation is so complicated by religious and racial feelings, one might say by religious and racial animosities, and by centuries of misunderstanding between the English and Irish peoples, that a wholly satisfactory solution is wellnigh impossible. There should, however, be general agreement on certain fundamental points. Firstly, a solution must be found which will give to the Irish people the right to manage their own affairs and will at the same time preserve the unity of the Empire. Secondly, that there are grave differences of opinion in Ireland itself as to the political status and form of government which Ireland should enjoy, differences of opinion between the North and South aggravated by religious and racial feelings, and that these differences of opinion cannot be ignored, but must be frankly recognized. Thirdly, the proclamation of the Government of Ireland Act providing for separate Parliaments for

Funda-
mentals
of the
Irish
problem.

the North and South is a factor in the situation which is bound to have a very great effect on the ultimate solution of the problem. The spectacle of a Parliament actually in session, even though it be in Belfast, cannot but strike the imagination of the Irish people and appeal to them as a practical proof of the sincere intent of the British people to yield to them the right to manage their own affairs.

The strong, sincere words of His Majesty at the opening of the Ulster Parliament, in which he appealed for Irish unity, struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the Irish people. His Majesty said :

‘ The eyes of the whole Empire are on Ireland to-day, that Empire in which so many nations and races have come together in spite of ancient feuds, and in which new nations have come to birth within the life-time of the youngest in this hall. I am emboldened by that thought to look beyond the sorrow and the anxiety which have clouded of late my vision of Irish affairs. I speak from a full heart when I pray that my coming to Ireland to-day may prove to be the first step towards an end of strife amongst her people, whatever their race or creed.

‘ In that hope I appeal to all Irishmen to pause, to stretch out the hand of forbearance and conciliation, to forgive and to forget, and to join in making for the land which they love a new era of peace, contentment and goodwill. It is my earnest desire that in Southern Ireland, too, there may ere long take place a parallel to what is now passing in this hall ; that there a similar occasion may present itself and a similar ceremony be performed.

‘For this the Parliament of the United Kingdom has in the fullest measure provided the powers; for this the Parliament of Ulster is pointing the way. The future lies in the hands of my Irish people themselves. May this historic gathering be the prelude of a day in which the Irish people, North and South, under one Parliament or two, as those Parliaments may themselves decide, shall work together in common love for Ireland upon the sure foundation of mutual justice and respect.’¹

The British Government has been quick to seize the opportunity which the appeal of His Majesty has afforded and has now offered to Ireland the status of a Dominion in the Britannic Commonwealth, subject only to such modifications as may be rendered necessary by the geographical position of the two countries; and conferences are now proceeding in London between representatives of the British Government and of the majority in Ireland in an earnest effort to reach common ground and a fair and just understanding. The long tragedy of Irish history has been the success of extremists, sometimes on the one side and sometimes on the other, in blocking a reasonable Anglo-Irish settlement whenever such a settlement has been in sight. All must earnestly hope that the present negotiations will prove successful, that the last chapter of the unhappy history of Anglo-Irish relations has been ended, and that a new and better chapter is about to be written. Every friend of England and Ireland

¹ Reported in English newspapers, 23 June 1921.

must utter this prayer, and if a settlement is effected and the new constitution comes into operation, Canada will be among the first to welcome Ireland as one of the sister Dominions of the Britannic Commonwealth. When one recalls the long and bitter political controversies which have waged around the Irish question, the present proposal of Dominion Home Rule cannot be looked upon as other than a great act of self-renunciation on the part of the English people, but an act which the circumstances both warrant and demand, and there appears to be every reasonable ground for hope that the proposal will be accepted in the spirit in which it has been made. The settlement of the Irish question would be a very great contribution not only to unity and good understanding among the English-speaking peoples, but also a valuable contribution to World Peace.¹

INDIA AND THE EAST

The government of India raises the whole problem of the East and West—the Orient and the Occident. One requires a knowledge of India and the East to appreciate its complexity and its difficulty. A few general considerations are now, however, fairly obvious.

¹ See Preface, p. xiii, and Appendix A, p. 267. The Treaty has been ratified by the English Parliament; in Southern Ireland, pending the elections to be held on the question of ratification, a Provisional Government has been installed, to whom Dublin Castle has been handed over.

First, the yellow races are challenging the right of the white races to dominate the world. No one will question that the Western nations have assumed a superior attitude towards the Eastern peoples, whose civilization is centuries older than theirs, a civilization which the peoples of the East still consider superior to that of the West. The great progress of the West in material civilization has enabled the Western peoples largely to dominate the East. This spirit of domination is not confined to governments. The individual European in his relations with the Eastern peoples sometimes manifests a contempt for their personal feelings which can only produce deep-seated resentment. The author of the *Dyarchy*, referring to this matter, says: 'If the true history of every Indian anarchist could be written, I venture to say that hardly one would be found in which the first bent to political crime has not been given by some disgraceful incident of the kind. I must say with emphasis', he adds, 'that such conduct is not typical of Englishmen in India.'¹ John Morley says: 'India is a country where bad manners are a crime.'² This manifestation of contempt is not all on one side, but that is no justification for its manifestation on either side.

The phenomenal progress of Japan, her success in the war with Russia, and her present place

¹ *Dyarchy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1920, pp. 1, li.

² Quoted in *Dyarchy*, p. xlix.

among the Great Powers, have appealed to the imagination of the East. Japan looks upon herself as the leader of the Eastern world and as the chief spokesman of the yellow races. Japan's demand for racial equality is not a demand for Japan alone. It is a demand for all the yellow races—they challenge the right of the white man to dominate the world. Who can deny the justice of such a challenge? The British people have disowned any such claim and have taken practical steps to prove their sincerity. We should not, however, confuse equality with similarity. While there may be full recognition of racial equality there should be equal recognition of racial differences, differences that have a most vital bearing on all the relations between the races. Theories cannot change facts nor make things that are different the same.

Nation-
ality in
the East.

Secondly, the idea of nationality is stirring the East profoundly. The doctrine of self-determination proclaimed to the world, without limitation or qualification, had enough dynamite in it to blow up almost all governments in the East that were not purely national. In the East particularly it was destructive rather than constructive. The phrase 'self-determination' is capable of almost any interpretation that interested parties may choose to put upon it, and it has been seized upon by Nationalist extremists to carry legitimate national aspirations to lengths which make the

task of government and of constitutional reform extremely difficult. One must recognize, however, that there is a clear and distinct Nationalist movement in the East similar to that in Europe during the nineteenth century, which must be reckoned with. This movement may give to both India and China a truly national consciousness.

Thirdly, the religious question. Islam is the most militant and least tolerant religion. For the followers of Islam the Koran provides both the religious and civil code. In his thinking the Moslem does not distinguish between the two. For him Church and State are practically one, and his devotion to his faith is unlimited. He looks to the Caliph as the head of Islam with the same devotion that a devout Roman Catholic looks upon His Holiness the Pope as the head of his Church. Nearly one-half of the entire Moslem population of the world lives within the Commonwealth. In spite of the call of their religion, when Turkey proclaimed the Holy War and called upon all the faithful to take up arms with her against the Allies, the Moham-medan subjects of His Majesty proved their devotion to the Crown by refusing to respond to this appeal, and they proved their loyalty through the trying years of the war. While there were some disturbances, these were small compared with the devotion of the great mass of the people who stood true throughout. The delay, however, in the

Islam.

preparation, execution, and ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey has given ample time for an organized campaign against any dismemberment of the Turkish Empire or any curtailment of the powers of the Sultan, their Caliph. Some of the Moslem subjects of His Majesty in India claim that they were assured that the integrity of the Turkish Empire would be preserved, and that the territories of their Caliph would be respected. The British Government does not appear to have given any such pledge, but there is no doubt that many Mohammedans have been persuaded that they did. The Mohammedan subjects of the Crown in India have protested against the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres and the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire which this Treaty provides. It is this question which has given rise to the Caliphate agitation which has swept over India and the East, and has been used by agitators like the Ali brothers in India to stir up widespread antipathy to British rule throughout the East.

The non-co-operation movement.

There has been a growing Nationalist movement in India for some years, the more moderate leaders demanding constitutional reform under the British Crown, the more extreme being hostile to the continuance of British connexion. The leadership in the more radical phases of this movement has been steadily passing into the hands of Mr. Gandhi, an idealist and a man of great force of character,

who has captured the imagination of the masses of the Indian people. In the latter part of the year 1920 he 'announced his intention of heading an All-India movement independent of caste and creed, with the threefold object of securing redress of the Punjab wrong, of satisfying Muslim feeling which had been wounded by the Treaty of Sèvres, and of obtaining Swaraj or self-government within a year'.¹ The Punjab wrong, or what is called by Indians the 'Amritsar Massacre', was the shooting by General Dyer's orders, without first calling upon the meeting to disperse, of a number of Indians gathered at a public meeting held in defiance of orders given under martial law. General Dyer claimed that the meeting was evidence of open rebellion against the Government. He justified his action by the generally disturbed state of the district, the organized destruction of Government property, and the attacks upon the lives of Europeans, and he considered the action necessary to strike terror into the rebellious spirits not only of Amritsar but of all India. General Dyer's defenders say his prompt action saved India from the horrors of a second mutiny. His opponents say it was 'sheer, cold-blooded frightfulness of the worst German variety'. The Hunter Commission, appointed by the Government of India to investigate the affair, while recognizing the grave conditions existing in the

¹ *Round Table*, September 1921, No. 44, p. 868.

Punjab, and the extreme difficulties of General Dyer's position, condemned his action as extreme and unjustified by the circumstances, and their report has been approved both by the Government of India and the Imperial Government and General Dyer has been retired from the service. His own testimony fully warranted the finding of the Hunter Commission. While the action of the Government of India on the Hunter Report has been accepted by more moderate opinion in India as being just and reasonable under the circumstances, it has not satisfied the radicals or extremists. All India has been profoundly stirred by the Punjab affair. They look upon it as a massacre of defenceless Indians by order of the military authorities, and it is no exaggeration to say that General Dyer's action has adversely affected the whole British position in India.

Swaraj.

Swaraj is an ideal which Mr. Gandhi has not so far clearly defined, but its organized expression is hostility to British rule. Its very vagueness enables him to enlist the support of all who are dissatisfied with present conditions, social, economic, or political. Mr. Gandhi is looked upon by the masses as a prophet, and he wields an almost unparalleled influence over them.

The non-co-operation movement is in one sense religious in its character. Mr. Gandhi claims that the Government in India 'represents the activity

of Satan', and that he who so believes has 'no choice left to him but to disassociate himself from it'. By withdrawing all support from the Civil Government and by refusing to comply with its demands, Mr. Gandhi and his followers would paralyse all government in India. The special Congress which met in Calcutta in September 1920 named certain items in which they would endeavour to make non-co-operation effective.¹

Among these the most important were: (1) gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned, aided, or controlled by the Government, and in the place of such schools and colleges the establishment of national schools and colleges in the various provinces. (2) The gradual boycott of the British courts by lawyers and litigants and the establishment of private arbitration courts by them for the settlement of disputes. (3) Refusal on the part of the military, clerical, and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia. (4) Withdrawal by the candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils, and refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election. (5) The boycott of foreign goods. This list has since been added to substantially and now includes non-payment of taxes.

The movement has passed through various

¹ *Round Table*, March 1921, No. 42, p. 377.

phases, in some of which it has succeeded, in some failed, but it is so widespread and Mr. Gandhi has such an immense influence that the course or ultimate issue of the movement is difficult to foresee or predict.

In the past the British Government has preserved the peace between Moslem and Hindu in India. But for the British Government India would have been the seat of constant religious wars, but now the extreme Nationalist leaders, like Mr. Gandhi, and the extreme Mohammedan Caliphate agitators, like the Ali brothers, have joined hands to support both the Caliphate and the Nationalist non-co-operative movements. These movements affect conditions all through the East, and enormously increase the difficulties of government and of constitutional reform.

A fifth factor is the economic situation. The masses of the people of India are exceedingly poor. The war has raised prices and greatly increased taxation, with the result that the people are much more heavily burdened and they are less able to bear the burdens than before the War. Dissatisfaction and unrest are natural ; they are the inevitable result of the war and of the economic conditions prevailing in India. It is not difficult for those opposed to the Government to persuade the people that the responsibility for these conditions rests largely with the Government, nor to

lead them to believe that Swaraj would remedy the ills from which they suffer.

It is under this combination of difficulties of almost unprecedented magnitude that Great Britain is trying to work out new experiments in government in the Eastern World. As India contains almost three-fourths of the population of the Empire and almost one-fifth of the population of the world, its good governance is a matter of vital concern to the Empire as a whole and to the peace of the world.

The problem of the Government of India is two-fold, that of the government of India itself, and that of the association of India with other members of the Commonwealth. We are liable at times to overlook the magnitude of the task.

Two
Indian
problems.

‘India is an immense sub-continent comprising nearly two millions of square miles. . . . Its inhabitants number over three hundred millions. . . . These vast multitudes do not form a homogeneous nation—on the contrary they are divided among themselves by the extremest differences of race, language, civilization, and religion. Racial divergencies of immemorial antiquity have been accentuated and stereotyped by a caste system so rigid that the axioms of European democracy are the merest absurdities to the philosophical Brahmin. The doctrine of equality if applied to himself and one of the pariah class would appear but blasphemous nonsense; the doctrine of fraternity, if it so much as required him to enter the same house as one of a lower grade, would seem to him to be sacrilegious sophistry. . . .

The Benthamite principle of the greatest good of the greatest number would be regarded as obviously false in a population wherein a man of one caste out-weighs in value and importance all the constituent members of a lower caste taken together. The very idea of the rule of the majority is alien from the mode of thought of the Indian, in whom inequality is incarnate; it is entirely beyond his conception.' ¹

This was the view of British India almost universally entertained before the War, but the Nationalist movement is creating an entirely new situation and it is difficult to speak with any degree of certainty as to its results upon the thought and life of the diverse races, religions, and castes of India.

The Indian Empire of His Majesty is under one supreme authority, the Viceroy, and includes both British territories and some three hundred native States. The relations between the native States and the British Government are regulated by treaties, which have been published and fill many volumes. Some States, called Allied States, with a total population of 27,000,000 are practically independent, except that the suzerain power does not permit them to make war on one another or to form alliances with foreign States. The remaining States, with a population of 35,000,000, have less independence. To every considerable native

¹ Hearnshaw, *Democracy and the British Empire*, 1920, Constable, pp. 151-3.

Court a British political or diplomatic agent is accredited.

The change brought about by the introduction of British rule into India was well described by Lecky when he said :

‘ Remember what India has been for countless ages before the establishment of British rule. Think of its endless wars of race and creed, its savage oppressions, its fierce anarchies, its barbarous customs, and then consider what it is to have established for so many years over the vast steppes from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin a reign of perfect peace ; to have conferred upon more than two hundred and fifty millions of the human race perfect religious freedom, perfect security of life, liberty and property, to have planted in the midst of these teeming multitudes a strong central government, enlightened by the best knowledge of Western Europe and steadily occupied in preventing famine, alleviating distress, extirpating savage customs and multiplying the usages of civilization and progress.’ ¹

The greatness of the task Great Britain has accomplished can be better realized when we remember that India is peopled by races speaking one hundred and eighteen different languages, with no common language of communication but English.

In this country we probably do not appreciate the very great steps which have been taken toward giving India self-government and affording facilities for the training of her people in the task of govern-

Self-
govern-
ment in
India.

¹ Lecky, *Historical and Political Essays*, 1908, pp. 61, 62.

ing themselves. The two greatest steps have been the Morley-Minto reforms and the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals of 1917, embodied in the present Government of India Act. These proposals were announced in the House of Commons on the 20th of August 1917 as follows :

‘ The policy of His Majesty’s Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India, as an integral part of the British Empire . . . progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive steps. The British Government and the Government of India on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be the judges of the time and measure of each advance, and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility.’ ¹

This pledge, given during the war, was redeemed by the Government of India Act of 1919, the preamble of which contains the above declaration. Under this Act Great Britain is now trying her greatest experiment in democratic government. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, one of the representatives of

¹ Secretary of State for India (Mr. Montagu), *Hansard*, 1917, 20 August, col. 1695.

India at the Prime Ministers' Conference in London in June 1921, speaking of this Act, said: 'The Government of India Act of 1919 forms a great landmark in the growth of the Indian Constitution. There is nothing in our previous history with which it can be compared either in importance or in magnitude.'¹

The Act of 1919 created two legislatures for the Central Government of India. The Upper Chamber, called the Council of State, consists of fifty-nine members, thirty-three of whom are elected and twenty-six nominated by the Viceroy. Of the nominated members nineteen are officials. The Lower Chamber, called the Legislative Assembly, consists of one hundred and forty-three members, of whom one hundred and three are elected and forty nominated. About one-half of the budget is votable by the Legislative Assembly and thus the members have a very real power and responsibility. Military and certain other items are not subject to vote of the Assembly. The Council of State and the Assembly which have been entrusted with real power have shown so far that they know how to use it with moderation born of responsibility.

The New
Constitu-
tion.

The Act also provides for the constitution of Provincial Legislatures for the several Provinces of India. In considering the distribution of

¹ *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 33.*

powers between the Central and Provincial Governments one may make a comparison on broad lines with our Canadian Constitution. Our Federal Parliament has exclusive jurisdiction over matters of general national concern, and the Provincial Legislatures have exclusive jurisdiction over matters of local or provincial concern. In India there is the same general division. The Central Government administers directly foreign affairs, defence, currency, railways, posts, telegraphs, and relations with the native States. The Provincial Governments administer such important matters as justice, police, education, sanitation, public works, irrigation, and forests; but, differing from the Canadian Constitution in this, and more nearly approaching the South African, the Central Government may legislate on any of these provincial matters if need arises.

In Canada we have both in the Dominion and in the Provincial spheres, not only representative government, but also responsible government, that is, an Executive responsible to a parliamentary majority, as distinguished from an Executive which may take the advice of Parliament but is not bound by it. In India the Morley-Minto reforms introduced a measure of representative government, that is to say, elected Indians were associated in the work of government, but no provision was made for responsible government. Under the Government of India Act, 1919, the

representative principle is greatly extended and the elected members have a very real control in matters of legislation. But the greatest and most far-reaching change made by the Act of 1919 was the introduction of the principle of responsible government in the provincial field. By that Act the provincial area of government is divided—certain subjects are still to be administered under the present system, but other subjects, e.g. education, sanitation, and kindred matters of great importance, are ‘transferred’ to the control of the people in each Province. In ‘transferred subjects’ the Governor is to act on the advice of his responsible ministers, responsible to an elected Chamber, though he may in exceptional circumstances act otherwise. The scheme is designed to educate the Indian in the actual operation of responsible government, so that he may learn to use the power entrusted to him for the benefit of the people. Hitherto his position as an elected representative not responsible for the actual work of government has made him a critic—now he is to be given the responsibility of legislation and administration. He must render an account of his stewardship to his own people. There is thus introduced a scheme of government which may in practice amount to responsible government in its fullest sense within the substantial area above indicated. The operation of the Act will come under review by a

Statutory Commission at the end of ten years with a view of determining whether the principle of responsible government should be extended or restricted.

The new Constitution became effective in 1920. The first general elections, both for the Central Government and the Provincial Legislatures, have been held and the new Governments have been duly organized and are now administering the affairs of India. With a ceremonial befitting the great event the first Session of the Central Parliament was opened in Delhi in February, 1921, by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, who concluded his address with a most earnest appeal for co-operation between British and Indians :

‘ Since I landed I have felt around me bitterness and estrangement between those who have been and should be friends. The shadow of Amritsar has lengthened over the fair face of India. I know how deep is the concern felt by His Majesty the King-Emperor at the terrible chapter of events in the Punjab. No one can deplore those events more intensely than I do myself.

‘ I have reached a time of life when I most desire to heal wounds and to re-unite those who have been disunited. In what must be, I fear, my last visit to the India I love so well, here in the new Capital, inaugurating a new constitution, I am moved to make you a personal appeal, put in the simple words that come from my heart, not to be coldly and critically interpreted.

‘ My experience tells me that misunderstandings usually mean mistakes on either side. As an old

friend of India, I appeal to you all—British and Indians—to bury along with the dead past the mistakes and misunderstandings of the past, to forgive where you have to forgive, and to join hands and to work together to realize the hopes that arise from to-day.’¹

The appeal evoked a generous response from the moderate elements of the population, but it had no effect on the extremists.

The Viceroy and other British officials in India are doing their best to secure the active and sympathetic co-operation of the people in the working of the new Constitution and many of the best men in India are heartily co-operating, but under Mr. Gandhi’s leadership large numbers of the people have declined to take any part. Undoubtedly there are grave difficulties in the way of its successful operation, difficulties which at the present may appear almost insuperable, but, given time, patience, sympathy, and the spirit of co-operation which so many leading Indians are displaying, it is possible that this greatest experiment may be an enduring success. The future is in the hands of the people of India themselves; they can make it or mar it. The visit which His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales is now paying to India should materially help the situation.²

India
and the
Empire.

The association of India with the other peoples

¹ Reported in *Round Table*, vol. xi, No. 43, June 1921, p. 640.

² The visit of the Prince to India has been concluded. Mr. Gandhi has been arrested, tried, and sentenced to six years’ imprisonment; and there seems at present to be a lull in the agitation.

of the Empire involves two questions: first, the status of Indians in other portions of the Empire; and, secondly, the position of India in the Imperial and other Empire Conferences.

India and
the
Empire.

The status of Indians in other portions of the Empire is one of the most important and difficult questions which the Governments of the Dominions and India have been called upon to face. It has been more acute in South Africa than in any other portion of the Empire, although we have had our own difficulties in British Columbia, particularly in 1914 when the steamer *Komagata Maru* with a large number of Indians on board was refused permission to land its passengers, as their entrance into Canada was prohibited by the immigration law and regulations then in force. The attempt to force a landing provoked strong feeling on both sides. The ship was compelled to return to India, and on its return disturbances took place in India which indicated that agitators were using the immigration restrictions in Canada to stir up trouble in India and create hostility to British rule. Any discrimination or alleged discrimination against Indians in any of the Dominions is made the ground of appeal to popular feeling against the British Government in India which is in no way responsible, and it has contributed substantially to the present unrest in India.

The question of status was carefully considered

at the Imperial War Conferences of 1917 and 1918, and the principle of reciprocity of treatment between India and the Dominions was accepted and applied. It was recognized as 'an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities'. It was also agreed that 'British citizens domiciled in any British country, including India, should be admitted to any other British country for visits, for the purpose of pleasure or commerce, including temporary residence for the purpose of education . . . but such right shall not extend to a visit or temporary residence for labour purposes or to permanent settlement'.¹

This agreement marked a real advance on the conditions which had previously prevailed, but it did not satisfy the people of India, and their representatives brought the question up again at the Prime Ministers' Conference in July, 1921. The Conference adopted a resolution, South Africa dissenting, which, while re-affirming the resolution of the 1918 Conference above quoted, recognized the incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British

¹ *Minutes of Proceedings of Imperial War Conference, 1918* (Cd. 9177), p. 195.

Indians lawfully domiciled in some other parts of the Empire, and expressed the opinion that those disabilities should be removed.¹

The question of status in its various aspects raises the whole racial problem of the East and West, and under the flexible constitution of the Commonwealth it can be discussed, and has been discussed repeatedly, around the common council table, the men of the West meeting face to face with the men of the East and each seeking to understand and appreciate the other's point of view. This is the most congenial atmosphere in which to reach a good understanding and the place where a reasonable and just solution is most likely to be found.

As India was not fully self-governing, her representatives were not admitted to membership in the Imperial Conference until 1917, and then by grace rather than by right, but through action taken at that Conference, India was duly admitted to membership in the Imperial Conference, and she was cordially welcomed as a member of the Imperial War Conference of 1918 and of all subsequent gatherings. She took her place with the Dominions and Great Britain at the Paris Peace Conference, and became a member of the League of Nations. Her representatives have been conspicuous for their ability and moderation.

¹ *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives*, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 8.

While they have firmly maintained the rights of India, they have frankly recognized the rights of the other members of the Commonwealth, and they have earnestly and sympathetically co-operated in all matters of common Imperial concern.

India is steadily moving toward full responsible government, and in time, as her people prove their capacity for it, she will take her place with Canada and the other Dominions as one of the sister self-governing nations of the Britannic Commonwealth. This great conception makes its appeal to the mind of the East just as it appeals to the mind of the West. One of the ablest of the younger native Christian leaders of India, of strong Nationalist sentiment, recently said in substance: 'If I thought that the only future for India in the British Empire was to be governed by men of another race, I would favour the termination of British authority in India, but when the British Government proposes, as I believe sincerely, by the policy now introduced, to lead India along the path of responsible government until she can take her place with Canada and the other Dominions as self-governing, sovereign States of the Britannic Commonwealth, united in devotion to a common Sovereign, it is a conception so magnificent, so hopeful for my country and for my race, that I cannot but devote myself to the attainment of this great ideal.'

When one recognizes that the Oriental peoples throughout the centuries have been accustomed to an autocratic and not to a democratic form of government, that they have accepted the monarchical principle of authority and have not been accustomed to accept and abide by the decision of the majority, one realizes the magnitude and difficulty of the experiment which is now being tried in India. When one considers the population of India and the complexity of the problems there arising, one cannot fail to appreciate that it is the greatest experiment in democratic government since the French Revolution. If it succeeds, if it demonstrates that the Oriental peoples are capable of democratic self-government, it paves the way for democracy in the East, and helps to bridge the gulf between the East and the West and makes easier that co-operation between them so essential to the peace and progress of the world.

EGYPT

The
British
Protec-
torate.

The problem of Egypt is different from that in India. Egypt is not part of the Empire, nor has she ever been such. During the war Turkey's sovereignty over Egypt was terminated and a British Protectorate was proclaimed. The following is the proclamation issued by the British Government :

‘ His Britannic Majesty’s Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs gives notice that in view of the state of war arising out of the action of Turkey, Egypt is placed under the protection of His Majesty and will henceforth constitute a British Protectorate.

‘The Suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt is thus terminated, and His Majesty’s Government will adopt all measures necessary for the defence of Egypt and protect its inhabitants and interests.’¹

The ‘special position’ of Great Britain in Egypt dates from her intervention in 1882 to restore order during the Arabi rebellion—an intervention in which the other Powers, though invited, declined to participate. On the 22nd July 1882 Mr. Gladstone stated the policy of the British Government in the House of Commons. ‘We feel’, he said, ‘that we should not fully discharge our duty if we did not endeavour to convert the present interior state of Egypt from anarchy and conflict to peace and order. We shall look, during the time that remains to us, to the co-operation of the powers of civilized Europe if it be in any case open to us, but if every chance of obtaining co-operation is exhausted, the work will be undertaken with the single power of England.’ France refused to co-operate and England alone established peace in Egypt and re-arranged Egyptian affairs. The British policy was to restore order to Egypt, to inaugurate certain elementary reforms

¹ Quoted in *Report of the Special Mission to Egypt*, 1921 (Cmd. 1131), p. 7.

and then withdraw the British troops, but the Cabinet under-rated the difficulties of getting out of the country. It was easier to intervene than to withdraw, and it was soon recognized that the presence of a British garrison was necessary, not only to make possible the carrying out of the reforms, but to prevent a relapse into confusion and anarchy.

Egypt at the time of the British intervention was a subject country, subject to the Turk. This position was not interfered with until the war. The result was that one alien race, the British, had to control and guide a second alien race, the Turk, by whom they were disliked, in the government of a third race, the Egyptian. Under British direction stable government has been introduced and maintained. Nepotism and corruption in official circles have largely disappeared. The country which was bankrupt at the time of British occupation has discharged its obligations and is now in a good financial position. Great national irrigation works have been constructed, the agricultural area has been enormously increased, the administration of justice has been placed on a sound basis, and peace and order have been maintained. The Fellaheen of Egypt have enjoyed a personal liberty and a freedom from despotism never before experienced. A simple incident will illustrate the beneficial change brought about by British co-operation. When in

Egypt in 1905, in conversation with one of the Fellaheen, I asked what the Egyptians thought of British occupation. He replied, 'Most people do not like it, but I do', and when asked why he liked it, he said, 'Before the British came, you leave your donkey out all night, your donkey gone in the morning, now the British here, you leave your donkey out all night, your donkey here in the morning.'

The Protectorate declared by Great Britain in 1914 has been acknowledged by the other Powers, but, although accepted by the Egyptian Nationalists as a war measure, it has since the conclusion of the war been made the occasion of most violent attacks by Zaghlul Pasha and the Nationalist party. During the war martial law prevailed, but with the return of peace the British Government planned to re-establish civil government on a basis which would give just expression to Egyptian national aspirations and would at the same time safeguard essential British interests. Accordingly in May 1919 the British Government announced that a special mission would proceed to Egypt in the autumn to confer with representatives of the Egyptian people as to the future government of Egypt. The mission, presided over by Lord Milner while still a member of the British Government, not only spent some months in Egypt but later had prolonged consultations with Zaghlul Pasha and the other Nationalist leaders in London.

The Na-
tionalist
Move-
ment.

There were three main factors in the situation. First, the Nationalist insistence on complete independence ; secondly, the problem presented by the capitulations or unilateral and non-terminable Treaties ; and thirdly, the special interests of Great Britain in Egypt. The capitulations date in some cases from 1581, and under them thirteen Powers have different and very extensive rights in Egypt. The special interest of Great Britain in Egypt is recognized by all the Powers and is undoubtedly very great, particularly in the maintenance of her communications with India and the East. Egypt lies alongside the Suez Canal, which controls the route to India, and it is through Egypt that land access is secured to the Sudan. At these conferences the Nationalists admitted Great Britain's special interests in Egypt, but no definite understanding was arrived at as to how these interests were to be safeguarded. Great Britain on her part proposed to recognize Egyptian independence subject to her special interests being safeguarded, and to use her influence to obtain the abrogation of the capitulations.

The
Milner
Report

The Milner Commission recommended that a treaty be entered into between Great Britain and Egypt, which would establish the independence of Egypt, but would afford guarantees for the protection of Great Britain's special interests and provide for Great Britain's influence toward the abrogation of the capitulations. Egypt was to

have the right to appoint her own representatives with diplomatic status, in foreign countries, but where none were appointed Egyptian interests would be entrusted to the care of Great Britain. It has been generally understood that the report was not approved by all Lord Milner's colleagues, and before action was taken upon it Lord Milner resigned from the Government.

Since the Milner Report was presented prolonged conferences have taken place between Adli Pasha, the Prime Minister of Egypt, and members of his Government and Lord Curzon, representing the British Government, but so far no agreement has been reached. The principal difficulty appears to be over the claim of the British Government to determine the number and location of British troops in Egypt for the purpose of protecting British interests. The Egyptian Government contends that this amounts to a denial of independence and to a continuation of military occupation. In the meantime Zaghlul Pasha, the Nationalist leader, is carrying on a violent agitation against the present Government of Adli Pasha and denies their authority to conclude an agreement with Great Britain. Had the Milner Report been promptly adopted by the British Government and its recommendation carried into effect, the proposals might have been accepted by the Egyptian people, but the delay has added to the strength of the more violent and

aggressive elements, and the whole situation appears to be growing increasingly difficult. The whole position in Egypt is one of great complexity and difficulty.¹ The outstanding facts in the situation are:

(1) Modern Egypt has been made possible by British occupation and British co-operation in the government of the country.

(2) The Turkish yoke has been thrown off and Great Britain is now endeavouring to work out an agreement with the Egyptian Government whereby Egypt will attain a position of independence in the management of her own affairs, an independence which would not have been possible but for the nearly forty years of patient effort on the part of the British people in the re-habilitation of the country and in the training of the Egyptians in the work of government.

(3) The delays in dealing with the question have greatly added to the difficulty of finding a satisfactory solution.

MESOPOTAMIA

In Mesopotamia, the cradle of the human race, of which Great Britain has been appointed mandatory under the League of Nations, an Arab Kingdom has been set up with Emir Feisal as

¹ A 'Declaration of Egyptian Independence' has now been issued by Lord Allenby, subject to the non-interference of foreign Powers and to the safety of British communications with the East. A Ministry has been formed and elections are to be held. See Preface, pp. xiv-xv.

King. With the advice and assistance of Great Britain an effort is being made to develop an independent Arab State in this ancient, impoverished, but fertile territory. There are many people in Great Britain who doubt the wisdom of Great Britain's assuming any responsibility in Mesopotamia—they think their country already has problems enough to solve. There are many others who approve of her accepting the responsibilities but not of the manner in which she is attempting to discharge them—they say, what is required is a strong Government and a firm hand.

An Arab
Kingdom.

The answer to the latter is that when the King of the Hedjaz entered the war on the side of the Allies against Turkey the British representative in Egypt, with the approval of his Government, entered into an agreement with him that upon the liberation of the Arab peoples from Turkish rule an independent Arab Kingdom should be constituted, the boundaries of which were roughly defined in the agreement and included much that is now under French mandate as well as Mesopotamia. The word of Great Britain is pledged to this policy, and whatever may be the result of this new enterprise Great Britain owes it to herself and to the Arab tribes to carry out the promises made during the war. That she should keep her solemn pledge is more important than the immediate success of the experiment.

PALESTINE

In Palestine, which also has passed under British rule as a mandated territory under the League of Nations, the British Government is endeavouring to provide a national home for the Jews, and so to administer the affairs of the country that justice shall be done to the Moslem and Christian inhabitants who constitute the majority of the population, and that law, order, and religious toleration shall prevail throughout the whole land. This is both an extremely difficult and a thankless task. It constitutes one of the most difficult experiments in government which any British administrator has been called upon to undertake. This unique experiment will be followed with the greatest interest by all students of the science of government, and by all interested in the future of the sacred land of Palestine.

Is it not a striking and significant event in the history of the development of the science of government that at the same time in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, 'two of the primaeval homes of man' and two of the great centres of Empire of ancient times, and in Palestine, the bridge which connects the two and over which the tides of commerce and war have flowed and re-flowed for countless generations, the British people should be assisting in the establishment of governments based on freedom, justice, and religious toleration ?

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

In still another part of the Commonwealth another form of government is passing and giving place to a new order. Southern Rhodesia, since its acquirement by the Crown, has been under the government of the British South Africa Company, of which Rhodes was the founder and the controlling spirit throughout his life. Following the Jameson Raid, which was organized in Rhodesia, a measure of Imperial control was introduced and a Legislative Council was set up, part of the members being appointed and part elected. The elected members have been the spokesmen for the British settlers in Southern Rhodesia. As has been the history of the men of our race in whatever part of the world they have located, the British settlers have demanded the right of self-government and the termination of the rule of the Chartered Company, and in the election for the Legislative Council held in 1920, twelve out of the thirteen elected members were returned pledged to responsible government. The charter of the British South Africa Company will shortly terminate, and in any case a change in the situation has become imperative. A delegation representing the British settlers came to England to interview the Colonial Secretary, and the British Government must decide in the near future what is to be the form of the future Govern-

The
British
South
Africa
Company.

ment of this territory. Southern Rhodesia covers nearly 150,000 square miles and lies between the Zambezi River and the Union of South Africa. It was at one time the home of Lobengula and his trusted warriors and was won for the Crown by Cecil John Rhodes. In the lonely grandeur of the Matoppos, in a sepulchre hewn out of the solid rock on the top of the mountain, Rhodes lies buried in the land he loved. It is no wonder his spirit broods over the place and his memory is still one of the most potent influences in Rhodesia. His thought was that Rhodesia would ultimately form part of South Africa. Geographically, it should form part of the Union of South Africa, and conferences have taken place between the representatives of Southern Rhodesia and General Smuts with a view of discussing a basis for union. Looked at from this distance, the best solution would appear to be union, and Rhodesia would then become one of the States of a United South Africa.

European
and
Native.

The problem of responsible government is complicated by the relatively small European population and the large native population. There are only about 33,000 European inhabitants, and alongside of them dwell over 770,000 natives. The natives throughout South Africa prefer British government to the rule of the European settlers, and in view of the conditions existing in Africa the British Government would undoubtedly

hesitate about turning over the government of the 770,000 natives in Southern Rhodesia to the 33,000 Europeans. In the proposals now under consideration for granting responsible government, provision is made for the British Government retaining a very direct control over the officials administering native affairs.

The relation of the European to the native in Southern Rhodesia is but one phase of the race problem which is the gravest question facing Africa to-day. Undoubtedly the natives in Africa are gradually developing a racial consciousness and a capacity for co-operation. In the Union of South Africa they outnumber the whites in the proportion of four to one, in Southern Rhodesia they outnumber the whites more than twenty-three to one, in Northern Rhodesia the disproportion is very much greater; and tropical Africa is now, and must remain, the black man's country. The British administrators in Africa are seeking to deal with this racial problem in a sympathetic way with a view of protecting the interests of the natives, while not unduly retarding the development and progress of the country.

The relation of the white and black races inhabiting the same territory is one of the most difficult and baffling problems with which our American neighbours have been called upon to deal. They have not found any wholly satisfactory solution so far. The British Empire is

seeking to work out the problem in the home of the black man in Africa. The peace of Africa depends upon its solution.

BRITISH EAST AFRICA

In British East Africa, which is still the hunter's big game paradise, the British Government is facing the same problem as in Southern Rhodesia, but complicated by the fact that large numbers of Indians are settled there. They came in originally to work on the construction of the railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza. They were followed by Indian traders and merchants, and they are now engaged in all kinds of trade and constitute a most important element of the population. They demand equal political and civil rights with the European settlers, and the Government of India is championing their cause. The European settlers are unwilling to have these rights conceded—they feel that they are entitled to control development of the high table-lands of East Africa suitable for white settlers. The Government has encouraged European settlement and these table-lands have been taken up by British settlers who are seeking to establish almost at the equator a European civilization. The British Government must consider not only the claims of the relatively small European population, and the still larger Indian population, but also the claims of the hundreds of thousands of natives

for whose future welfare the Government must accept a large measure of responsibility. British East Africa is a real meeting-place of the races, white, brown, black ; Europe, Asia, Africa. It will require all the genius for government which British administrators possess to work out a policy fair and just to all races.

I have mentioned Ireland, India, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Rhodesia, and British East Africa, because of what they illustrate and signify—Europe, Asia, and Africa ; white, brown, black ; Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox ; Moslem, Hindu, and Jew ; Animism, Fetishism, Monotheism. In every one of these countries an earnest effort is being made to work out a constitution suited to the needs of the people and one under which the people will be given such a share in the government as they are qualified to exercise, from complete self-government and Dominion status in Ireland to the administration of Palestine under the British High Commissioner. There is nothing comparable with this in history. The action of the United States in the suppression of disorder in Cuba and subsequently granting substantial independence to Cuba and the action of the United States in the Philippines are of a similar character, but neither are the difficulties of the situation nor is the scale of the experiment comparable with those of the Britannic Commonwealth.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Geo-
graphical
position
of the
Empire.

The geographical position of the members of the Commonwealth makes the maintenance of a navy essential, if for no other purpose than to police and protect the highways of travel and to maintain communication between the different communities of the Commonwealth ; but as these highways are upon all seas, the British Navy in protecting the highways has preserved the freedom of the seas, not only for the trade and commerce and communications of the Commonwealth, but for that of all other nations, and who can measure the extent of this contribution to World Peace ? In the last war the British Navy made success possible, and without the strength and efficiency of the navy democracy and human freedom would have been overthrown by the Prussian military autocracy.

It is only necessary to look at the geography and to consider the population of the Britannic Commonwealth to realize that for the sole purpose of defence she requires a very much larger navy than any other Power can possibly require for this purpose. The British Navy has to defend an area of one-quarter of the land surface of the globe ; one-fourth of the world's population ; thirty-five per cent. of the world's trade ; and forty-five per cent. of its steam merchant shipping. It is the fact of the naval requirements of the Commonwealth which makes her position at the

Washington Disarmament Conference so unique and notable. For more than two hundred years Great Britain has been the greatest naval Power in the world, and for more than a century her navy has been supreme on the high seas. It was Germany's challenge of this position of supremacy by her naval programme that convinced thoughtful men of Germany's determination to endeavour to dominate the world by force, and compelled Great Britain to build new ships to preserve her unquestioned superiority and thereby the integrity of the Empire and the freedom of the seas. To no nation of Europe would Great Britain yield or share her place upon the seas, but now at Washington, to promote disarmament and peace, the naval policy of two centuries is reversed and the British Empire cheerfully agrees to surrender her place as the first naval Power of the world and to accept the principle of equality with the United States in the naval disarmament. This has been possible because the British peoples have absolute confidence in the pacific intentions of the Government and people of the United States. There could be no more convincing proof of the pacific intentions of the British Empire and of the resolute determination of her peoples to promote and support the movement for disarmament and World Peace than the acceptance, both in principle and in spirit, of the American proposals for the limitation of naval armaments.

Benefits
of peace
inherent
in the
fact of
Empire.

The inhabitants of the Britannic Commonwealth enjoy all the blessings of peace which the Imperium of Rome conferred upon an unsettled world. Of those blessings of peace, the Pax Romana, the poets have sung, and justly sung; but the Pax Romana at the maximum of Rome's power only applied to one hundred million people. The Pax Britannica applies to four hundred and forty millions of people, four times as many as those of Rome in her palmiest days. The maximum extent of the Empire of Rome was about two and one-half million square miles, the British Empire is over thirteen million—peace over an area five times as great as that of Rome in the height of her power, preserved not by force but by liberty and the rule of law. What State in history has made so great a contribution to World Peace affecting the lives and happiness of such countless multitudes of people? Not only is war between the component parts of the Empire unthinkable, but the spirit of mutual good-will which comes from a common allegiance is greater than could possibly be maintained were the bond dissolved. But the benefits of peace inherent in the fact of Empire are not confined to interstate questions. Peace has been maintained within the borders of the various States, peace between race and race, between native and native, and native and European, peace between religion and religion. The surge of Moslem and Hindu war in India has

been stilled ; and notwithstanding the agitations, national in character, now going on in India, Egypt, and Ireland, one may say, broadly speaking, that throughout all the territories of the Empire there has been peace. That is one of the most striking contributions of the British peoples to the cause of peace. There have been in the past so many bitter and bloody wars originating in the discontent of the governed, that any nation which is able to develop a system of government which is carried on with the good-will of the governed is contributing to the peace of the world.

‘ May we not even add that it is in no small part due to their place in the British Empire that these vast sections of the globe with their diverse and sometimes jarring interests maintain a perfect peace with us and with each other and have escaped the curse of an exaggerated militarism ? ’ ¹

So far we have been considering the Empire from within, and discussing the peace which has come to those within its borders. Its influence beyond its borders has been almost as great. If one-fourth of the population of the world is firmly at peace, not only is the danger to the remaining three-fourths greatly lessened, but there is less prospect that the peace of the one-fourth will be interfered with by the unprovoked attacks of any of the nations comprising the remaining three-fourths.

Form of government contributes to international peace.

¹ Lecky, *Historical and Political Essays*, 1908, p. 62.

If this great Commonwealth were governed by a militaristic autocracy or united under an Imperium with militaristic ambitions, it might be, it would be, a grave menace to the world's peace, but the British Empire is not an Imperium, it is not governed by a militaristic autocracy—it is a group of self-governing, democratic nations and India, which is being gradually democratized, united in willing loyalty to a common Sovereign. It differs from all Empires of the past in one essential respect, that 'it is based not on force but on good-will and a common understanding. Liberty is its guiding principle. Where that principle has not already been established, it is gradually being introduced into the structure.'¹

The British Empire is organized for peace, the Roman Empire was organized for war—this is the great contrast between the two. His Majesty alone can make war or peace, but His Majesty must act upon the advice of his constitutional advisers. No one Government in the Empire can speak for all in the matter of waging war or making peace. While theoretically the British Parliament still has the legal power to legislate for the whole Commonwealth, constitutionally the British Parliament would have no more right to conscript men in Canada or to levy taxation for

¹ Lloyd George, *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives*, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 15.

war or any other purpose than would the Canadian Parliament have the right to do so in England. It is the practical genius of the British people for government which has solved this problem, and each self-governing nation of the Commonwealth determines just as fully and completely as any independent sovereign State the character of its own participation in war, the extent of its contribution and the manner in which it shall be raised. Common action is secured by consultation and co-operation. 'Liberty is the guiding principle.' The organization of the Commonwealth is for peace and not for war, though in a just war, such as the last, which commanded the support of all its people, it was by far the most formidable Power in the world, and as such made the largest contribution to freedom and to peace. But the form of its organization, its political and social ideals, and its vital interests, are all on the side of peace. Peace is its great objective and is essential to its progress and development.

CHAPTER VII

THE EMPIRE'S DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE

England
and arbi-
tration in
history.

WHEN, during the Protectorate, the military power of England stood at its height, we find Oliver Cromwell turning to arbitration as a method of settling international questions. Cromwell's Treaties with the Dutch in 1654, with John IV of Portugal in the same year, with France in 1655, and with Charles Gustavus of Sweden in 1656, all contain elaborate articles providing for the determination of certain questions by arbitration. The Treaty of Peace, for example, with the Netherlands in 1654 provided that four commissioners should be named on both sides to meet at London to examine all losses in the East Indies, in Greenland, Moscovy, Brazil or elsewhere, of which either party complained. If the commissioners did not agree in writing within three months, the differences were to be submitted to the judgement and arbitration of the Protestant Swiss Cantons, who were to delegate commissioners whose decision or the decision of the majority of whom was to bind both parties.¹

The lead given by Cromwell was followed in later Treaties. The Treaty of Charles II in 1674

¹ *A General Collection of Treaties, 1642-1731*, London, 3 vols.

with Holland contained clauses similar to those in the Treaties already referred to, while the Treaty of Ryswick between Great Britain and France in 1697 provided for the creation of two commission courts, the first to determine the right of each of the parties to certain places in Hudson Bay, and the second to settle the question of the right of William III to revenues of the Principality of Orange, of which he had been deprived by Louis of France.

While those instances of arbitration are of historical importance, what may be called the modern practice in international arbitration began one hundred years later. During the French Revolution serious causes of friction arose between Great Britain and the United States and both countries were rapidly drifting toward war. To avert this catastrophe the Jay Treaty, so called after John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, the American Plenipotentiary, was negotiated in 1794 and provided for the settlement of all outstanding questions by arbitration. This Treaty, though strongly supported by President Washington, was modified and almost wrecked in the Senate; Jay was burned in effigy and he and his Treaty were damned from one end of the country to the other. History has reversed this judgement and a distinguished American writer on questions of international law says that Jay's reputation as a benefactor of his kind rests upon

The Jay
Treaty.

the firm foundation of this Treaty, and that the policy of the United States in the matter of international arbitration and the peaceable settlement of international disputes was determined at the very beginning of her history by Jay. History was repeated one hundred and twenty-five years later in the action of the Senate in a Treaty of vastly greater moment to mankind, and the negotiator, President Woodrow Wilson, was thoroughly damned by many of his fellow countrymen. History will reverse the judgement on Woodrow Wilson and the impartial historian will rank him, and justly rank him, as among the greatest Americans.

Is it not significant that the Jay Treaty, the first of the modern Treaties of Arbitration, should have been concluded between Great Britain and the United States? From that time forward these two Powers have done more than any other to advance the cause of the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The
Treaty of
Ghent.

The next conspicuous example of a Treaty providing for arbitration was the Treaty of Ghent in 1814. This Treaty, which closed the war of 1812-14 between Great Britain and the United States, provided for the settlement by arbitration of certain boundary disputes, including the right to certain islands claimed both by the United States and Nova Scotia.

Fifty-seven years later there was signed between

Great Britain and the United States the greatest single arbitration Treaty of modern times. This Treaty, the Treaty of Washington, 1871, provided for the settlement of the most formidable list of difficult and dangerous questions ever dealt with by one Convention. The matters covered included : (1) the *Alabama* and similar claims, as to which feeling on both sides of the Atlantic ran very high ; (2) questions relating to the Atlantic fisheries ; (3) the navigation of the St. Lawrence and passage through Canadian Canals ; (4) the transit of goods through Maine and the lumber trade down the River St. John ; (5) the Manitoba boundary ; (6) the San Juan water boundary ; (7) the claims of British subjects arising out of the Civil War ; (8) claims of Canadians from the Fenian Raids ; and (9) the revision of the rules of maritime neutrality. In this Treaty we see two great and powerful nations losing nothing in patriotism or in self-respect, showing the world that neither the magnitude of a controversy nor its alleged connexion with national honour need be a bar to its peaceful solution. This Treaty may be said to be the real beginning of the modern movement for international arbitration.

Treaty
of
Washing-
ton.

Following this Treaty there must be mentioned four further great Treaties of Arbitration to which Great Britain was a party, and which removed serious causes of international friction : the Behring Sea Arbitration of 1893 between Great

Britain and the United States; the Venezuela Boundary Arbitration of 1899; the Alaska Boundary Arbitration of 1903; and the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration of 1909.

The
Olney-
Paunce-
fote
Treaty.

Each of these Treaties provided for the determination of certain specific disputes. But such special treaties cannot provide a certain method for settlement of all disputes. If the dispute has become acute, if popular passion has been aroused, there is always the danger that one or other of the States concerned will not agree to arbitration. To avoid this danger and to provide in advance for the arbitration of all disputed matters, Great Britain and the United States negotiated the Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty in 1897. Article I of the Treaty provided:

‘The High Contracting Parties agree to submit to arbitration in accordance with the provisions and subject to the limitations of the Treaty all questions in difference between them which may fail to adjust themselves by diplomatic negotiations.’

The Treaty was strongly supported by President Cleveland, but, unfortunately, failed of ratification in the United States Senate.

In 1903 Great Britain and France concluded the first general arbitration treaty of modern times. This Treaty is in terms not as wide as the Olney-Pauncefote Treaty, but it is a landmark in the movement for international arbitration. It provides for a reference to the Permanent Court of

Arbitration established by the Hague Convention of 1899, of differences of a judicial order or relating to the interpretation of existing treaties, which it may not be possible to settle by diplomacy, provided, however, they do not involve the vital interests, the independence or the honour of the two contracting States, and do not concern the interests of third parties. The reservations are important, for it is open to the contracting States to determine what matters affect their vital interests, independence, or national honour. In 1908 Great Britain and the United States concluded a similar Convention, which was duly ratified.

In 1914, as was pointed out on p. 20, a notable advance was made in the Treaty concluded between Great Britain and the United States for the establishment of a Permanent Peace Commission to investigate and report on all disputes between the two nations of every nature whatsoever, other than 'disputes, the settlement of which is provided for and in fact achieved under existing agreements', and they agreed not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigations and before the report is submitted. This Convention may be said to foreshadow one of the most important provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

It is not merely in the negotiation of special and general arbitration treaties that Great Britain has been a leader in the movement for the peaceable

Limita-
tion of
arma-
ments.

settlement of international disputes ; she has led or strongly supported every general movement in this direction from the first Hague Peace Conference in 1899 to the formation of the League of Nations twenty years thereafter. The first Hague Conference of 1899, like the Washington Conference of 1921, was called for the purpose of considering and devising a means for the limitation of armaments. The Powers, however, found themselves unable to reach an agreement. Germany refused to consent and there were other practical obstacles difficult to overcome. The Conference was saved from total failure by the action of Sir Julian Pauncefote, the first delegate of Great Britain, and his colleagues, who took the lead in the movement for the creation of a permanent tribunal of international arbitration. The work of the British Delegation at this Conference was publicly recognized by Mr. Choate, the first delegate of the United States, at the second Hague Conference in 1907, when he said :

‘ Following the noble initiative of Lord Pauncefote, that great and wise statesman, who was the first delegate of Great Britain, whose persuasive words upon the subject will never be forgotten, the first Conference after establishing for all time principles of arbitration created a tribunal to which all nations, whether signatory powers or not, may voluntarily resort for the determination of all arbitration upon which they might agree.’

It should not be forgotten that the British

proposal was strongly supported by the United States and other Powers, and all co-operated in carrying it forward to a successful conclusion. At the second Hague Conference, 1907, the United States proposed the formation of a Permanent Court of International Justice and she was supported in this movement by Great Britain and other Powers. In fact, both in the first and second Hague Peace Conferences Great Britain and the United States worked together, and, to a large extent, voted together for the accomplishment of the great aims of those Conferences.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

One of the greatest contributions of the Britannic Commonwealth to World Peace is the support its several members have given to the creation and work of the League of Nations and to the establishment and organization of a Permanent Court of International Justice. While President Wilson was the greatest advocate and the most influential supporter of the Covenant of the League of Nations at the Paris Conference, the movement would have failed but for the leadership and support given to it by the British Empire delegation. Among the responsible statesmen actually engaged in the conduct of international affairs, no man has spoken in support of the League with greater force or more persuasiveness than Viscount Grey. As early as the 24th November 1916, while

The
Empire
and the
League.

still Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, he said :

‘ I certainly desire to see a League of Nations formed and made effective to secure the peace of the world after this war is over. I regard this as the best, if not the only prospect of preserving treaties and of saving the world from aggressive wars in the years to come.’

During the years which have elapsed since that declaration was made, Viscount Grey has not ceased to urge with all the weight of his great authority the vital importance in the interests of World Peace of the establishment and maintenance of the League of Nations. Mr. Lloyd George, speaking on the 12th November 1918, the day after the Armistice was signed, declared :

‘ A large number of small nations have been reborn in Europe and these will require a League of Nations to protect them against the covetousness of ambitious and grasping neighbours. In my judgement a League of Nations is absolutely essential to permanent peace. Are we to lapse back into the old national rivalries, animosities and competitive armaments, or are we to initiate the reign on earth of the Prince of Peace ? What are conditions of peace ? They must lead to a settlement which will be fundamentally just. No settlement that contravenes the principles of eternal justice will be a permanent one. The peace of 1871 imposed on France by Germany outraged all the principles of justice and fair play. Let us be warned by that example. We must not allow any sense of revenge, any spirit of greed or grasping desire to over-ride the fundamental

principles of righteousness. We shall go to the Peace Conference to guarantee that a League of Nations is a reality. I am one of those who believe that without peace we cannot have progress.'

At the Peace Conference Lord Robert Cecil and Lieutenant-General Smuts were second only to President Wilson in the energy and ability which they gave to the task of framing the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The nations of the Britannic Commonwealth promptly ratified the Treaty and thereby became members of the League of Nations. Since its organization they have given it powerful support, and the success which the League has already attained could not have been secured without their co-operation. In so saying, one does not overlook the splendid contribution made to the success of the League by the other States, members of the League, who have participated in its deliberations and given it their whole-hearted support.

After two years' experience, the Britannic Commonwealth stands more strongly than ever behind the League of Nations. The position of Canada and South Africa is well known. In November 1921 the principal political leaders of Great Britain issued a signed statement and appeal on behalf of the League of Nations Union, in which the following appears :

'An effective League of Nations is the only

alternative to war ; but it is only a practical alternative if they, the public, choose to make it so.

‘ We have anxiously watched the League during its two years of life, and we are satisfied that it can be made to function successfully, provided the people support it. But we are equally convinced that without popular support it is bound to fail.’

This consistent attitude on the part of Great Britain and the other members of the Britannic Commonwealth in supporting international arbitration, the League of Nations, and the Permanent Court of International Justice should be the best evidence that the Britannic Commonwealth can be counted on to give its whole-hearted support to every practicable move designed to promote international justice and peace.

THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE FUTURE

What contribution to World Peace can the Britannic Commonwealth make in the future ? There have been four principal causes of war in the past—dynastic, economic, religious, and racial. Dynastic wars as such would appear to be a thing of the past. Many wars in the past have been waged for profit, but the last great war has shown that no State can gain economically as a result of a great war, and therefore wars waged on economic grounds alone are not so likely to arise in the future.

Some of the most bitter and most bloody wars have been religious, but one would fain hope that the day of religious wars is past. Islam is un-

doubtedly the militant religion of the world to-day. Out of more than 200,000,000 Moslems, nearly one-half are within the Britannic Commonwealth. In the past the Commonwealth has been able to preserve peace between Moslem and Christian, and Moslem and Hindu, and if the Britannic Commonwealth is able to maintain peace between the different religions within her own territories, she will have largely saved the world from further religious wars.

The ultimate and most pressing problem of international politics appears to be the racial one. The Roman Empire failed to solve the problem of the East and the West and it fell apart into two worlds, the Greek and the Roman. If the British Empire fails to solve it, she must look forward to the same fate. As already pointed out, she is now conducting the greatest of all her experiments in the realm of government, viz. to lead an Oriental people without any practical experience in the working of democratic institutions and without the political ideas which lie at the basis of such institutions in the path of democratic, responsible government. The urgency of the racial problem was indicated by Mr. Lloyd George at the Prime Ministers' Conference in London on the 20th of June, 1921 :

‘ No greater calamity could overtake the world than any further accentuation of the world's divisions on the lines of race. The British Empire

has done signal service to humanity in bridging these divisions in the past; the loyalty of the King-Emperor's Asiatic people is the proof. To depart from that policy, to fail in that duty, would not only greatly increase the dangers of international war; it would divide the British Empire against itself. Our foreign policy can never range itself in any sense upon the differences of race and civilization between East and West. It would be fatal to the Empire.' ¹

If the British Commonwealth can solve the problem of co-operation between East and West, can bridge the gulf that racial difference creates and racial prejudices would tend to widen, she will have rendered one of her greatest services to the human race and one of her largest contributions to the peace and progress of all mankind.

Unity of
the
Empire.

What have the freedom and unity of the British Empire meant to the world during the trying years of the Great War? No man is in a better position to judge of this question than Mr. Lloyd George. In his opening address to the Conference of Prime Ministers in London in June, 1921, he said:

'May I just remind the Conference of what our unity has meant? The war demonstrated—I might say revealed—to the world, including ourselves, that the British Empire was not an abstraction but a living force to be reckoned with. Who would have believed before the war that the Empire outside Great Britain would, in an hour of emergency, have raised two millions or more

¹ *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives*, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 13.

soldiers and sent them to the battlefield to serve the common cause side by side with the United Kingdom ? . . . The opportune revelation of the reality of the British Empire has in my judgement altered the history of the world. Those of us who know—and many, if not most of us, sitting at this table were here during the most critical hours of the war, and sat at this same table—those of us who know how narrow the margin was between victory and defeat can proclaim without hesitation that without these two million men, that came from outside the United Kingdom, Prussianism would probably have triumphed in the West and East before the American troops arrived on the stage, and Lord Curzon, who is at this moment discussing with M. Briand, the Prime Minister of France, the execution of a victorious treaty, would have been discussing how best to carry out the humiliating conditions dictated by the triumphant War Lords of Germany. The reign of unbridled force would have been supreme and this generation would have had to spend its days in interpreting and enduring that calamitous fact in all spheres of human activity and influence. The unregulated unity of the British Empire saved France, Britain, and civilization from that catastrophe.’¹

It was my privilege to be present at the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet during the early summer of 1918 to which Mr. Lloyd George refers, and I can only add that the information received by us at that time fully warrants this statement.

While the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet were in progress, there was not a little comment

¹ *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives*, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 15.

in a portion of the press of Canada on the absence in London of the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues who had gone over to attend the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference which had been called to consider grave questions relating to the prosecution of the War. The Prime Minister and his colleagues desired to return to Canada at the earliest possible date and they urged the early termination of the meetings. The situation at the Front was very critical ; another German attempt to break through the Allied Line on the Western Front was daily expected. Each day's delay was a day's gain for the Allies, for the United States was now sending over men at the rate of 300,000 per month and Great Britain and the Dominions were steadily strengthening their forces by the new men who had been called up and were in process of training. The critical question was, could Germany strike and strike successfully before adequate reinforcements had reached France and had completed their training so as to take their place in the line ? After the disastrous results of the Spring offensive no one could be certain as to the future.

It was under these conditions that Mr. Lloyd George urged Sir Robert Borden to delay his departure. He pointed out that if another German offensive should be successful and the line should be broken, they might be called upon to consider

whether the British Empire should make peace with a victorious Germany or should fight on, alone if need be, depending upon its command of the seas to assure final victory or a not inglorious peace. This was the momentous issue which it appeared possible they might be called upon to face, and Mr. Lloyd George desired the personal presence in London of the Dominion Prime Ministers in order that they might be in a position to consider all eventualities and decide on the course to be pursued. Sir Robert Borden did not leave England until after Germany had struck her last great blow and it was not only evident that the line would hold, but that Foch's counter-attack was making great headway.

The unity of that Empire is just as necessary to-day as it was during the period of the war. It is possible that we sometimes fail to appreciate what a revolution this war had wrought in the governance of very large sections of the human race. When the war broke out Germany, Austria, and Russia were under the rule of the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs. The principle of authority which the millions inhabiting these three Empires had recognized and respected was the monarchical. At a stroke these monarchies were swept away, and it was impossible to substitute immediately a new principle of authority and to expect that this principle would be recognized and acted upon by millions of people. It

Stability
and secu-
rity.

takes time to change the whole basis of a nation's thinking, and it may be a generation, or perhaps much more than a generation, before the same recognition of law and authority and the same degree of stability will prevail within the territories formerly embraced within these three Empires as existed before the war. The experience of France of a century ago should aid us in appreciating the present situation. To-day there is insecurity and instability everywhere. The greatest force making for stability and security throughout the world is the Britannic Commonwealth. Not only because of its own inherent strength and the stability of its institutions, but because it exercises its beneficent and stabilizing influence on every continent and in every quarter of the globe, the Britannic Commonwealth is to-day the greatest existing bulwark against the onrush of the forces of unrest, disorder, and disorganization. The only stabilizing force to compare with it is that of the United States of America, and up to this time the United States has not seen her way clear to co-operate fully in stabilizing the international situation. We all know what happened in the collapse of the Roman Empire, and if the unthinkable should happen, that the overthrow of the autocratic Empires of the world, Germany, Austria, and Russia, should be followed by the disintegration of the liberty-loving, free, co-operative Britannic Commonwealth, then where would humanity find rest? Where would

the forces seeking to restore the world to an equilibrium and balance be able to steady themselves ?

It is to be hoped that the future of the League of Nations is assured and that with the adhesion of all the great States to the Covenant in its present or in some modified form, the Council and the Assembly of the League will acquire the tradition, the prestige, and authority necessary for the performance of its great task. In order, however, that its future may be assured, in order that it may continue to receive the powerful backing which a united Britannic Commonwealth alone can give, and in order to promote peace and to preserve liberty and justice in the world, the British League of Nations, which we call the British Empire or the Britannic Commonwealth, must be preserved. 'The British Empire is a saving fact in a very distracted world. It is the most hopeful experiment in human organization which the world has yet seen.'¹ This British League has elements of strength not yet acquired by the League of Nations. It is a product of slow growth, it owes allegiance to a common Sovereign, it possesses a common flag and a common Imperial citizenship. Its members entertain a common affection and respect for that great country, *primus inter pares*, to whose genius the Empire owes its birth ; and all its

¹ Lloyd George, *Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives*, 1921 (Cmd. 1474), p. 15.

members are devoted to the same ideals of peace, justice, and liberty. Its constitution is sufficiently flexible to permit of the greatest freedom of action on the part of its constituent members and also the necessary co-operation in all vital matters of common concern.

The peace of the world will not be advanced by the Balkanization of the British Empire. The problem of East and West would be brought no nearer to a solution should India, South Africa, and Australia own no common allegiance and no longer meet at the common council table. The burden of armaments would be enormously increased and the general safety seriously diminished.

When one recalls what has been achieved in the three hundred years since the establishment of the island kingdom of Great Britain by the union of the Crowns of England and Scotland, who is there who will suggest that any statesman of Great Britain, during the whole three hundred years of her history, had the vision to see or the faith to believe that the Britannic Commonwealth of to-day would have been possible? It may not be given to us to look far into the future, neither our imagination nor our faith may be equal to the task, but if we are but as loyal and true to the ideals for which the Commonwealth stands to-day as were our fathers to the ideals for which Great Britain stood in the past, may we not go forward,

not only with hope but with assured confidence that the achievements of the past are but the earnest and the promise of that which may be, of that which shall be achieved in the future in the interests of peace, of justice, and of human liberty the world over ?

PART III
CANADA AND WORLD PEACE
CHAPTER VIII

TWO CONFEDERATIONS : A CONTRAST

Begin-
ning of
the Con-
federal-
tion.

EVEN the superficial observer must realize that the people who inhabit the northern half of the North American Continent are destined to play an important part in human history. Whether they welcome or regret the prospect, they cannot alter the fact ; Nature and Providence have so ordained. Canada and her future would be a most inviting subject to pursue, but only one aspect of this question can be touched on here, viz. Canada's relation to World Peace.

The first day of July 1867 witnessed the birth of the North German and the Canadian Confederations ; one had its genesis in war, the other in peace. The North German Confederation was made possible as a result of war between Prussia and Austria, and grew out of the treaty of peace between these two German States. Twenty-two States joined to form the Confederation under the hegemony of Prussia, with the King of Prussia as President. Subsequently, in 1870, as a result of the Franco-German War, the South German States

were admitted, making twenty-six States in all. The name of the Confederation was changed to the German Empire and the King of Prussia, as President of the Confederation, received the new title of 'German Emperor'. Alsace-Lorraine, acquired by the victories of the German States, became Imperial territory.

In 1867 the Dominion of Canada was formed by the peaceable co-operation and union of the four Provinces—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. Later Prince Edward Island and British Columbia were admitted. The Hudson Bay Territory, acquired by the young Dominion by purchase and not by conquest, became Federal property and from it have since been formed the three Prairie Provinces.

During the ensuing fifty years Germany developed remarkable industrial efficiency and made phenomenal industrial progress. Under the leadership of Prussia, she became a nation of soldiers and officials. Her people were taught that they existed for the State and not the State for the people; that war was one of the noblest expressions of national life; and that might was greater than right in international relations. By compulsory military service and by the size and efficiency of her army, she undoubtedly became the greatest military Power in the world.

The results of half a century of this teaching upon the German people themselves are clearly set

forth by one of the most distinguished of modern German thinkers, Walther Rathenau, the Minister of Reconstruction in the first Wirth Government which recently resigned. He says, 'Instead of the Germany of thought and spirit, one saw suddenly a brutal, stupid community of interested persons greedy for power, who gave themselves out as that Germany whose opposite they were ; who, unable to point to any thought of their own, prided themselves on an imaginary race unity which their very appearance contradicted ; who had no ideas beyond rancour, the slaverings of league oratory and subordination, and who with these properties which they were pleased to call " Kultur ", undertook to bring blessing to the world. . . .'¹ 'The system looked like a nation. In reality it was an autocratic association of economic interests bristling with arms.'² He adds, 'Kultur' is a 'word which Germany ought to prohibit by law for thirty years to come'.³ A distinguished British scholar, Sir Michael Sadler, has said, 'Without a further penny of tribute Germany has paid her indemnity to the world. She has proved the falsity of the ideal which poisoned her judgement.'⁴

Canada
in her
past.

Canada chose a different path. She devoted her energies not to military achievement but to subduing the forces of nature and opening up half

¹ Walther Rathenau, *The New Society*, 1921, pp. 92-3.

² loc. cit., p. 91.

³ loc. cit. p. 93.

⁴ *The International Review of Missions*, 1921, p. 455.

a continent to human habitation. Protected by His Majesty's Navy, Canada was enabled to devote her undivided energies to great domestic tasks, and from the very nature of the case it was almost inevitable that her politics should concern themselves largely with questions relating to national development and material progress, railways, canals, public works, immigration, colonization ; and critics are possibly not without warrant in suggesting that in some aspects at least our politics have not been idealistic. But an impartial historian, Viscount Bryce, in his *Modern Democracies*, has said, ' Law and order are fully secured everywhere, even in the wildest parts of the west. . . . The judiciary is able and respected, criminal justice is dispensed promptly, efficiently, and impartially.' ¹

The same writer pays a tribute to our schools, to our legislation, to our respect for private civil rights, and concludes, ' Canada is well prepared by the character of her people, by their intelligence and law-abiding habits, to face whatever problems the future may bring, finding remedies for such defects as have disclosed themselves in her Government and making her material prosperity the basis of a pacific and enlightened civilization.' ²

In her external relations Canada has stood for the pacific settlement of international disputes, and where diplomacy has failed, arbitration has pro-

¹ Bryce, *Modern Democracies*, 1921, vol. i, p. 500. ² loc. cit., p. 508.

vided a method of settlement. Her people are peaceable and peace-loving, but when German militarism plunged the world into war and challenged the forces of Democracy to a supreme combat the young Democracy of the New World without delay took her place side by side with Great Britain and France in the struggle for the preservation of human liberty and the establishment of public right in the world. On the morning of the 11th November 1918, one of the closing engagements on the Western Front was fought between the German militaristic autocracy and the Canadian democracy, when the Canadians captured Mons from the German troops.

When peace was being negotiated Canada stood for the creation of an international organization that might aid in the preservation of the peace, and has given her whole-hearted support to the League of Nations as a means of preserving that peace.

It is worth all that this war cost Canada as a nation to learn at the very beginning of our larger national life that (1) the ideals of materialism and militarism are false and lead to disaster; (2) that all nations are members of one great family, and that national isolation is no more possible in the family of nations to-day than is individual isolation in the life of the community; and (3) that co-operation for the preservation of peace is a more enlightened policy than competition in preparation for war.

CHAPTER IX.

CANADA'S PLACE IN THE EMPIRE

The importance of the British Empire to the future peace of the world has been pointed out in the last chapter. The Canadian nation becomes yearly an increasingly important factor in the British Empire, and is in a position to make, and should make, a real contribution towards preserving its unity, its strength, and its friendly attitude of co-operation toward all other nations.

Responsible
government.

What contribution has Canada made to the unity, the strength, and the stability of the Empire in the past ?

Her first and perhaps greatest contribution was the successful working out of the problem of responsible self-government. Every one recognizes at this time how impossible it would have been to preserve the unity of the British Empire if the policy of attempting to govern the Overseas Colonies from Downing Street had been persisted in ; and yet, when the agitation for responsible government in Canada was at its height, the view of responsible statesmen in the Motherland was that the granting of responsible government was entirely incompatible with the maintenance of Imperial connexion.

Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary in the Conservative Government of Great Britain in the

year 1844, in what was known in Canada as the 'Great Debate', stated that to place the Governor in a state of dependence upon his Council and Parliament was

'a course which by no gradual steps but certainly and at once would place the whole authority in the hands of the dominant party for the time, and convert Canada into a republic, independent of the Crown of this country. It was inconsistent with monarchical government that the Governor who was responsible should be stripped of all authority and all power, and be reduced to that degree of political power which was vested in the constitutional sovereign of the country. Not only would such a course be inconsistent with monarchical government, but also with the colonial dependence.'¹

Lord Stanley concluded his address as follows :

'I believe, when they seriously consider the results of the alternative I have put, they will follow, not the advice of the unprincipled demagogues—bad, rash and interested counsellors—but take as their guide the liberal, sound and honest views of the Governor-General.'

Baldwin and Lafontaine were the political leaders in Canada who were fighting the battle of Responsible Government, and Joseph Howe was fighting a similar battle in Nova Scotia. Lord Durham's report on political conditions in Canada, made in 1839, which is one of the most notable State documents in British Colonial history, had approved the principle for which Baldwin, Lafon-

¹ *Hansard*, 30 May 1844, vol. lxxv, p. 42.

taine, and Howe were contending, but the British Government of the day did not agree with Lord Durham.

Lord Elgin was appointed Governor-General of Canada in 1847. He at once recognized the justice of the claim for Responsible Government and with the full approval of the British Ministry, which had in the meantime changed, he accepted and applied the principle. A new Government was formed in 1848 by Baldwin and Lafontaine, who possessed the confidence of Parliament and of the country, and the great battle for Responsible Government was won.

Contrast the statement of Lord Stanley in 1844 with the statement made seventy years later by another British statesman, Sir Herbert Samuel, who, speaking before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said, 'Two great discoveries in the sphere of government have been made by the British people, discoveries which have moulded the shape of the modern world. The first was the principle of representation, which alone enabled order to be reconciled with liberty, and the other was Colonial self-government, which alone had enabled autonomy to be reconciled with unity.'

Colonial self-government, one of the two great discoveries in the sphere of government made by the British people, was contended for and secured by the people of Canada, not because they desired

separation from the Motherland, but because they believed self-government essential to the satisfactory management of their own affairs, and that with peace and contentment within Canada the ties that bound her to the Motherland would be strengthened rather than weakened. Events have justified their view, and this great principle of colonial self-government, thus established first in Canada, was subsequently successfully applied to all the Colonies of the Empire settled with European stock. It was the general recognition and adoption of this principle which has made possible the continued unity and strength of the Empire.

Canadian
Confeder-
ation.

The second great contribution of Canada was Canadian Confederation. Canada was the first country to apply the principles of Parliamentary Government to a Federation. By the union first of the four Provinces and later of the whole of Canada under one central Federal Government, Canada not only laid the foundations of a strong, prosperous, and united British nation on this half of the North American Continent, but by her successful experiment she made possible a similar union of the Australian Colonies and later still a union of the South African Colonies. To-day the scattered Colonies of Canada, Australia, and South Africa are three great self-governing Dominions within the British Empire.

At the time Confederation was proposed by Canada to the statesmen of Great Britain it was

not looked upon by them as a step that would strengthen the Empire, but as one that would lead naturally and inevitably toward the separation of Canada from the Mother Country and the organization of an independent State. It was the desire of the late Sir John Macdonald that the new Confederation should be called the Kingdom of Canada, but the name was not favoured by the British Government as it was thought it might offend the sensibilities of the people of the United States. The official trend of thought about the time of Confederation is well illustrated by the following extract from a letter of Lord Lyons, British Ambassador to Paris, to Lord Clarendon, British Foreign Secretary. Lord Clarendon had written asking his advice on some question concerning Canada, as he had been British Ambassador to Washington for many years. After discussing the political conditions in Canada Lord Lyons expressed the opinion that the great problem for Great Britain in American politics was to find some fair and honourable way of dissolving all connexion between England and her North American Colonies. He concludes—‘in fact it seems to be in the nature of things that the United States’ prestige should grow and ours should wane in North America and I wish we were well and creditably out of the scrape.’¹ Lord Clarendon on his side was equally emphatic.

¹ *Life of Lord Lyons*, 1913, Arnold, vol. i, p. 292.

‘I agree’, he wrote, ‘in every word you say about our position in North America and wish that they would propose to be independent and to annex themselves. We can’t throw them off and it is very desirable that we should part as friends.’¹

It is clear that Canada was not the spoiled child of an over-indulgent mother.

Here again the statesmen of the Mother Country were mistaken in their view, and history has shown that, with the larger powers and the greater freedom of action which have come to the people of Canada through Canadian Confederation, the ties that have bound Canada to the Motherland have been strengthened rather than weakened; and this also applies to the other self-governing Dominions.

Equality
of status.

The statesmen of Canada were the first to recognize that the strength and unity of the Empire could only be maintained by the recognition of the full equality of status of the Dominions with the Mother Country in the British family of nations.

This request for an equal status was supported by the representatives of the other Dominions, and when frankly presented to the statesmen of Great Britain was accepted by them as a necessary and logical constitutional development. This change in status has not been a sudden development, but a gradual growth, and the visible evidences of the change have been shown in the

¹ *Life of Lord Lyons*, 1913, Arnold, vol. i, p. 292.

further recognition from time to time accorded to the Dominions in the Imperial family, rather than by specific acts which have changed the status.

In 1887 advantage was taken of Queen Victoria's Jubilee to invite the representatives of the Colonies, as they were then called, to meet in conference in London with representatives of the Imperial Government to consider matters of common concern to the whole Empire. At this first meeting it was agreed that similar conferences should be held in the future.

The next important development was the decision of the Colonial Conference of 1907 to establish the Imperial Conference with a permanent Secretariat and fixed periods for meeting. The important part of the resolution for the establishment of the Conference is as follows :

‘ That it will be to the advantage of the Empire if a conference to be called the “Imperial Conference” is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and His Governments of the self-governing Dominions beyond the seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom shall be ex-officio President and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Dominions ex-officio members of the conference . . . that it is desirable to establish a system by which the several governments represented shall be kept informed during periods between the conferences in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion

by means of a permanent secretarial staff charged under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies with the duty of obtaining information for the use of the Conference, of attending to its resolutions, and of conducting correspondence on matters relating to its affairs.’¹

This resolution unanimously adopted at the Conference by the representatives of Great Britain and all the self-governing Dominions was afterwards approved and acted upon by all the Governments concerned and is the constitutional basis of the Imperial Conference. This marks a great advance over the original Colonial Conference of 1887.

‘This resolution established the status of the Dominions as national entities entirely distinct from that which inhabited the British Isles; it recognized that the basis of Imperial organization was the co-operation of five nations, not the centralization of power in the hands of the British acting as an Imperial Government. It finally destroyed the older conception of Imperial development as a gradual re-union of the colonies with the mother country through representation in either of the British Houses of Parliament.’²

With this statement by a writer on our constitutional development may the author be permitted to express his entire concurrence?

Sir Frederick Pollock, one of the foremost English Jurists and writers on constitutional

¹ *Minutes of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 1907* (Cd. 3523), p. v.

² *The Round Table*, vol. i, No. 4, August 1911, p. 394.

questions, speaking of the status of the Dominions some time after this resolution was passed, said :

‘ Leave the conventions alone and look at the facts, and we find the self-governing colonies are, in fact, separate kingdoms, having the same King as the parent group, but choosing to abrogate that part of their full autonomy which relates to foreign affairs. The House of Commons could no more venture to pass a bill altering the Australian marriage laws, or the Canadian tariff, than the Dominion Parliament could legislate on London tramways. The Sovereignty is a figment. The States of the Empire stand on an equal footing, except that the Government of one of them represents all the rest of the community of nations, and is gracefully permitted, in consequence, to undertake and to pay for maritime defence.’

And Mr. Balfour, speaking at a luncheon given at the Constitutional Club to the Prime Ministers of the Overseas Dominions in 1911, said :

‘ I cannot help thinking that as we have now thoroughly realized in every one of these great communities that each is to manage its own affairs—carry out its own life, make its own experiments as freely as if it were an independent political entity—as that is a truth thoroughly understood by every politician of every party in every one of these several communities—I cannot help thinking that upon that solid basis we shall build up something which the world has never yet seen, which political dreamers in the past have never yet dreamed of—a coalition of free and self-governing communities who feel that they are never more themselves, never more masters of their own fate, than when they recognize that they are parts of

a greater whole, from which they can draw inspiration and strength ; and that each lives its own life and is most itself when it feels itself in the fullest sense a self-governing entity which yet has a larger whole to look to, whose interests are not alien to it, on whom it can rest in time of trouble, from whom it can draw experience, to whom it can look, whom it can aid, and from whom it can receive aid.'

The next great step was the call by the Prime Minister of Great Britain to the Prime Ministers of the Dominions to meet with representatives of the Imperial Cabinet in London in 1917, in what was then described as an Imperial War Cabinet, to consider questions relating to the conduct of the war affecting the interests of the Empire as a whole. The Imperial War Conference which sat at the same time unanimously adopted the following resolution :

'The Imperial War Conference are of opinion that the readjustment of the Constitutional Relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.

'They deem it their duty however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth and of India as an

important portion of the same, should recognize the right of the Dominions and India to an adequate voice in the foreign policy and in foreign relations and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern and for such necessary concerted action founded on consultation as the several Governments may determine.' ¹

This declaration, for which we are principally indebted to Sir Robert Borden, representing Canada, and General Smuts, representing South Africa, has been generally accepted in all portions of the Empire as a recognition of the full equality of status of the Dominions with the Mother Country in the Britannic Commonwealth.

This changed status of the Dominions has been nowhere more clearly stated than by the Prime Minister of Great Britain speaking on behalf of the Government of Great Britain at the Prime Ministers' Conference held in London during the months of June and July last.

Referring to the part the Dominions and India had taken in the war, Mr. Lloyd George said :

' In recognition of their services and achievements in the war the British Dominions have now been accepted fully into the comity of nations by the whole world. They are signatories to the Treaty of Versailles and of all other treaties of peace. They are members of the Assembly of the League of Nations and their representatives have

¹ *Minutes of Proceedings of Imperial War Conference, 1917, Resolution IX.*

already attended meetings of the League. In other words, they have achieved full national status and they now stand beside the United Kingdom as equal partners in the dignities and responsibilities of the British Commonwealth.' ¹

The British Government has fully recognized in principle the equality of status of the Dominions with the Mother Country, and to-day the true definition of our constitutional relationship is that the members of the Britannic Commonwealth are a group or League of free, self-governing nations and India, united under a common Sovereign, bound together by ties of sympathy, of interest, and of common ideals, and preserving the strength and the unity of the whole through consultation and co-operation in all matters of common concern.

There are certain constitutional adjustments which should be made in order to give full expression to the principle of equality of status which has already been recognized, but these will come in due time.

Effects of
equality.

While Canada has led the way in this transition from a colony governed from Downing Street to a sister nation of Great Britain, she has received powerful co-operation and support, particularly in the later stages of the development, from statesmen of the other Dominions, especially from General Botha and General Smuts of South Africa.

There are some who appear to think that the

¹ *Summary of Proceedings at Conference of Prime Ministers* (Cmd. 1474), p. 14.

recent developments tend to separation rather than unity. Just as Lord Stanley in 1844 firmly believed that to place the Governor of Canada in a state of absolute dependence on his Council would at once make Canada an independent and republican colony, so there are those who to-day believe that to place Canada on an equality of status with the Mother Country in the British family of nations will tend to make Canada an independent and republican State. May one venture to express the opinion that those who entertain such views in the year 1921 are just as mistaken as was Lord Stanley in 1844? Both steps were inevitable in the development of political institutions among the independent, freedom-loving, and public-spirited men of British and French stock on this half of the North American continent. It is impossible to believe that the inhabitants of the Dominions would be prepared to continue indefinitely in a subordinate position to the inhabitants of the British Isles. It is the recognition of their equal rights which makes possible the unity and strength of the Commonwealth to-day. It is the recognition of this principle which has saved South Africa to the Commonwealth. We know the strength of the Nationalist movement in South Africa in favour of an independent Republic. Had General Smuts not been able to offer to the people of South Africa full equality of status in the Britannic Commonwealth

and to assure them that all their national aspirations could be realized, and more fully and securely realized, within the Commonwealth than without, I do not believe that he could have carried the country in the election of January, 1921, and instead of his Government pledged to unity and co-operation within the Commonwealth, we might have had a Government pledged to separation from the Commonwealth.

In the last lecture I pointed out what the freedom, the unity, and the stability of the Britannic Commonwealth had meant to the world during the trying years of the Great War. This was only made possible, however, by the constitutional developments of the past sixty years. I also pointed out how great was the need of that freedom, that unity, and that stability in the future. Canada, by reason of her position as the oldest, the largest, the most populous, and the most influential Dominion of the Empire, should play a worthy part in the preservation of that freedom, that unity, and that stability. Let us not forget that what the world needs to-day is not more of the spirit of self-determination, but more of the spirit of co-operation and unity. Canada stands midway between the European, the Asiatic, and Australasian States of the Empire. May she prove a bridge to bind them together.

Imperial
citizen-
ship.

We recall the declaration of the Apostle Paul when arrested in Jerusalem—‘And as they bound

him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, "Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman." Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, "Tell me, art thou a Roman?" He said, "Yea," and the chief captain answered, "With a great sum obtained I this freedom." And Paul said, "But I was free born." Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him; and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.' ¹

This story shows what Roman citizenship meant nineteen centuries ago—it embodies an appeal to Justice and the protection of the law by a citizen of Rome. Do we appreciate all our citizenship means to us? We are full Canadian citizens, but we are much more than Canadian citizens—we are citizens of the whole Empire. A Canadian can travel in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australasia, and still be a citizen—not a foreigner. We are the possessors of a great inheritance vastly greater than that possessed by a citizen of Rome. Our task is to improve it, to endeavour to realize its ideals, and to transmit those ideals to those who come after us.

¹ Acts xxii. 25-9.

CHAPTER X

CANADA'S EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Canada a
member
of the
League.

AS Canada's status within the Empire has advanced, she has taken on a larger measure of responsibility in respect of external relations, until now, by her admission to the League of Nations, she has become an acknowledged member of the family of nations.

The admission of the Dominions to the Peace Conference and to membership in the League of Nations was but the recognition internationally of the status which the Dominions had already acquired within the British family of nations. This is clearly shown by the proceedings which led up to the admission of the Dominions to the Conference, and subsequently to membership in the League of Nations. I quote from a dispatch of 4th December 1918 from the Government of Canada to the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister, then in London :

' Council to-day further considered Canadian representation at Peace Conference and is even more strongly of opinion than when you left that Canada should be represented. Council is of opinion that in view of war efforts of Dominion other nations entitled to representation at Conference should recognize unique character of British Commonwealth composed of group of free

nations under one Sovereign and that provision should be made for special representation of these nations at conference even though it may be necessary that in any final decisions reached they should speak with one voice. That if this is not possible you should form one of whatever delegation represents British Commonwealth.' ¹

The Britannic Commonwealth of free nations was a new form of political organization, unknown and consequently unprovided for, in the diplomatic usage of modern times. The question was whether the diplomatic usage should change to meet the new conditions, or whether the Commonwealth should be compelled to change the form of its political organization to conform with diplomatic usage. The answer to this question will be found in the reply of Sir Robert Borden, dated 2nd January 1919 :

'In Cabinet to-day, I took up question of representation of the Dominion and spoke very frankly and firmly as to Canada's attitude. My proposal, which I consider the most satisfactory solution that is practicable and which was accepted by the Cabinet, is as follows :

'1st. Canada and the other Dominions shall each have the same representation as Belgium and other small allied nations at the Peace Conference.

'2nd. As it is proposed to admit representatives of Belgium and of other small allied nations only when their special interests are under consideration, I urge that some of the representatives of

¹ *Canada : Sessional Papers*, vol. lv, No. 1 Special Session, 1919, Paper 41j.

British Empire should be drawn from a panel on which each Dominion Prime Minister shall have a place. . . . I emphasized the insistence of Canada on this recognition, and I urged that the British Empire has the right to define the constitutional relations between the nations which compose it and their consequent right to distinctive representation. It is anticipated that British Empire will have five representatives entitled to be present at all meetings of Conference. I expressed my strong opinion that it would be most unfortunate if these were all selected from the British Islands. Probably three will be named and two others selected from the panel for each meeting. The panel will comprise both British and Dominion Ministers. No public announcement can be made until these proposals have been communicated to allied Governments and accepted.' ¹

This proposal of Sir Robert Borden, strongly supported by the whole British Empire delegation, was accepted by other nations at the Peace Conference.

Condition
of mem-
bership
of the
League.

When the Covenant of the League of Nations was drafted, the right of the Dominions to membership was not only recognized, but a new principle was introduced into diplomatic practice and sanctioned by all of the nations which were parties to the Treaties of Peace, and by all the other nations which have since become members of the League, viz. that the condition of admission to the family of nations should be not independent and separate sovereignty, but full self-government.

¹ loc. cit.

Article I of the Covenant provides, 'Any full self-governing state, dominion, or colony . . . may become a member of the League.' This provision appears to have been overlooked by those who think that membership of the Dominions in the League is a step towards separation. It is just the reverse. Membership on the conditions named means that the other nations have recognized the unique character of the Britannic Commonwealth and have admitted the Dominions to the family of nations without involving separation or even the idea of separation from the parent State.

This is a great step in advance and opens the way to the Dominions obtaining full satisfaction of their national aspirations within the British Empire, just as the United States obtained the satisfaction of her national aspirations without the Empire.

The only important nations which have not so far recognized and accepted this new principle are the United States and Russia. Russia is not a party to the Treaty and has not been called upon to consider the question, but when she does one need not apprehend any dissent from her; there remains only the United States. We in Canada thought the United States would be the first to recognize and approve and the last to object to this new principle. The Wilson Administration approved it, and the United States signed the Treaty, but the Senate did not ratify it. We

cannot force the United States to give this recognition, but one has such confidence in the sense of justice and fair play of the people of the United States that one cannot believe when political passions are cooled and political antipathies die down they will finally deny to Canada, to the other Dominions, and to the Commonwealth as a whole, the status in the family of nations accorded to them by all the other nations of the world.

Because there was no invitation¹ to the Dominions to be present at the Washington Conference it is argued by some that the Dominions should not be represented. One cannot share that view. The issues are too grave for Canada and the world that we should stand on the form of the invitation. Canada is vitally interested in the questions under discussion. The decisions may have a profound influence on her future. Canada should be there in her own interests—she should be there for the sake of the Conference itself, and therefore we are gratified that she actually has a representative there in the person of the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, who while a member of the British Empire delegation is the distinctive representative of Canada. He has been welcomed by the United States with the utmost cordiality, and his presence is all to the good, both for Canada and the Conference.

¹ The invitation, following diplomatic practice, was addressed to the Government of Great Britain but was treated as an invitation to the British Empire.

Next to the unity of the British Empire, the most important factor in securing and maintaining peace and in promoting human progress is the co-operation of the Britannic Commonwealth and the United States of America. Our political affiliation with Great Britain and our sympathy and co-operation with the British people enable us to understand them better and to appreciate more fully the ideals and policies of their Government than do the people of the United States. One cannot but be struck in visiting the United States with the degree to which Great Britain is misunderstood by large sections of people in that country. She is misunderstood in no small measure because she is not known. We in Canada should be able to interpret the real Briton to the real American, and thereby promote a better understanding.

Anglo-Saxon
co-operation.

On the other hand, by reason of our geographical position and our close trade and personal relations with the people of the United States, we are able to understand them and their point of view better than it is possible for the people of Great Britain to do. Canada is one of the important States facing the Pacific. She must in time be one of the great nations on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic, and the problems of the Pacific are of vital interest to her. We can understand and appreciate the point of view of the citizens of the United States in reference to Pacific problems in

a way that it is hardly possible for the people of Great Britain to do, and we should be able to interpret the real American sentiment and spirit to Great Britain in a way that should promote a good understanding. One speaks not only of the present but of the future, of the time when Canada will contain not ten millions but twenty or thirty millions or more of Canadians of the type we have in Canada to-day. What will be our position and influence in the Empire then? Who can foresee what the next fifty years have in store for us? Co-operation between the British Empire and the United States may be even more important then than it is to-day. Canada's position and influence as a member of the British Empire and as a nation dealing with the United States will be much greater then than it is to-day, and no nation has an opportunity of making a finer contribution to international peace than has Canada by means of her ability to act as an interpreter and reconciler between the Britannic Commonwealth and the United States.

Canadian
representa-
tion at
Washing-
ton.

I do not believe, however, it is possible for Canada to discharge these high functions satisfactorily unless she is in closer touch with the situation at Washington and at London than she is to-day. We do a larger business with the United States than the United States does with all the States of Central and South America combined. Before the war, when Mr. Bryce was the

British Ambassador at Washington, considerably more than fifty per cent. of all the matters that required consideration at his hands were questions relating to Canada. And if we are to protect the interests of our own people in their dealings with our great neighbour to the South, and if we are to promote and preserve the good understanding already referred to, we should have a thoroughly competent Canadian Minister at Washington appointed under the arrangement already arrived at between the Governments of Canada and of Great Britain and approved by the Government of the United States.

This question has given rise to so much discussion, and there is apparently still such a misconception in some minds both as to the real nature of the proposal and the purpose to be served, that one need offer no apology for discussing the matter. The proposal for the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington was first introduced into the House of Commons in the year 1892 by the late Dalton McCarthy, K.C., and the general tenor of the discussion in the House was on the whole favourable to the proposal, but no action appears to have been taken by the Government of the day to carry out the resolution finally adopted by the House of Commons. The conditions which arose during the war compelled the consideration of the question anew and led to the appointment of a Canadian War Mission to Washington, which

rendered very valuable service to Canada during the last year of the war, and, subsequently, to an agreement between the British and Canadian Governments for the appointment of a Canadian Minister at Washington. The agreement or understanding was set forth in a statement or declaration made simultaneously in the British House of Commons and the Canadian Parliament on the 10th day of May, 1920 (*Hansard*, vol. iii, col. 2178):

‘ As a result of recent discussion, an arrangement has been concluded between the British and Canadian Governments to provide more complete representation at Washington of Canadian interests than has hitherto existed. Accordingly, it has been agreed that His Majesty, on advice of His Canadian Ministers, shall appoint a Minister plenipotentiary who will have charge of Canadian affairs and will at all times be the ordinary channel of communication with the United States Government in matters of purely Canadian concern, acting upon instructions from and reporting direct to the Canadian Government. In the absence of the Ambassador, the Canadian Minister will take charge of the whole Embassy and of the representation of Imperial as well as Canadian interests. He will be accredited by His Majesty to the President with the necessary powers for the purpose.

‘ This new arrangement will not denote any departure, either on the part of the British Government or of the Canadian Government, from the principle of the diplomatic unity of the British Empire. Need for this important step has been fully realized by both Governments for some time. For a good many years there has been direct

communication between Washington and Ottawa, but the constantly increasing importance of Canadian interests in the United States has made it apparent that Canada should be represented there in some distinctive manner, for this would doubtless tend to expedite negotiations, and naturally first-hand acquaintance with Canadian conditions would promote good understanding. In view of the peculiarly close relations that have always existed between the people of Canada and those of the United States, it is confidently expected as well that this new step will have the very desirable result of maintaining and strengthening the friendly relations and co-operation between the British Empire and the United States.'

Before this statement or declaration was made public, its substance was communicated to the Secretary of State of the United States and an intimation was received that the Government of the United States would very cordially welcome a Canadian Minister at Washington. To avoid misunderstanding it should be noted that the proposal is for distinctive representation of Canadian interests. This is fully secured by the arrangement, while the diplomatic unity of the British Empire is maintained. What are some of the practical reasons for the appointment? What is the situation we face to-day? There is a common international boundary between the United States and Canada of over 3,900 miles east and west, and of 1,500 miles between Alaska and Canada, or a total common boundary of 5,400

miles. For hundreds of miles this country runs through inland waters, and questions relating to boundary waters, fishery rights, and other matters of a like character are continually arising. Citizens of these two countries are constantly crossing and re-crossing this boundary, not only for the purposes of trade, but for the many and varied forms of intercourse inseparably associated with the life of the two peoples living side by side and largely of common racial origin, of common language, and of common social ideals.

In the matter of trade, we do a larger trade with the United States than with any other country in the world, and the United States does a larger trade with us than with any other country save Great Britain. Good trade relations between Canada and the United States are of the utmost importance to both countries.

Problems
of the
Pacific.

In the matter of political relations all must recognize that with the opening up and development of the countries of the East the centre of political and commercial activity of the world must pass to a material extent at least from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Many of the most important and significant political events of the next half-century will be enacted on the Pacific. It is in the basin of the Pacific that the great and grave problem of the relations of the East and West will be settled. The Conference in Washington, which not only dealt with disarmament but with

Pacific problems, is significant of the change. Pacific problems in the future are much more likely to be discussed and determined in conference on this continent than in Europe, as has been the case in the past. Who are the Powers on the Pacific? Canada is more vitally interested in the problems of the North Pacific than any other portion of the British Empire. She is more vitally interested in the problems of the North Pacific than is either Australia or New Zealand. They are more deeply interested in the problems of the South Pacific. Canada and the United States lie on one side of the North Pacific; Russia, China, and Japan on the other; and in all the problems that arise affecting the Pacific the people on this continent may find that they have common interests. It may be that we shall find that men sprung from the same race, speaking the same language, possessing the same ideals, are largely interested in the same questions, but whether we are or not, it will be of the greatest importance to Canada to know what are the ideals, the views, and the policies of the United States on the problems of the Pacific.

Few questions have aroused deeper or more widespread interest in the United States than that of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and on few questions has the position of Great Britain been more grievously misunderstood. On the other hand, until the last few months, the

Government and people of Great Britain have neither understood nor appreciated the depth of this feeling or its vital importance to the future of Anglo-American relations. There can be no doubt that Canada has contributed materially to a better understanding and appreciation of the situation through the position taken by her Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference in London in June 1921.

It is to be hoped that as a result of the Conference at Washington on Pacific Problems the Far-Eastern situation will be cleared up and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance will be superseded by a general understanding among all the Pacific Powers for the preservation of peace. Such a solution would be a very great contribution to a good understanding between the British Commonwealth and the United States, and would remove one of the grave causes of international distrust. We also face the Atlantic, and our political relations with Great Britain make the attitude of the United States toward European problems of the greatest interest and importance to us. How can we act as an interpreter and mediator unless we ourselves thoroughly comprehend the situation ?

According to the theory of those who oppose the appointment of a Canadian Minister at Washington, we have no right to speak to this neighbour with whom we are in daily intercourse, in such constant intercourse on such a large scale, and

with whom we must continue to deal in an ever-increasing measure, except through a Minister or Ambassador appointed by the Government in London and, if the United States should choose to make it so, except through London. Frankly, that is an impossible situation. It is impossible that it should continue indefinitely. Let me illustrate this. An acute discussion recently arose in the United States in reference to the export of pulp-wood from Canada, and an Act was passed by the Congress of the United States authorizing the President to name a Commission to confer with the Governments of the Dominion and of the Provinces of Canada on the question of the legislation prohibiting the export of pulp-wood. A communication from the Government of the United States in reference to this particular matter was made by the American Ambassador in London to Lord Curzon as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, by him transmitted to the Colonial Secretary in London, and by the Colonial Secretary to the Governor-General in Canada. It is only necessary to state this process of circumlocution to show how unsuited it is to the conduct of business matters in a practical business way as between the two countries. While it is true that communications are usually made direct from the British Ambassador at Washington to the Government at Ottawa, the United States is entitled, in the absence of a Canadian Minister, to

make the communication through London if it so wishes. One would commend to those who are opposed to this proposal the advice given more than two centuries ago by François de Callières, the distinguished French diplomat. In discussing the question of permanent representation of a country at a foreign Court, he said :

‘ Now, if a monarch should wait before sending his envoys to countries near and far, until important events occur . . . it will be found that the negotiators sent thus at the eleventh hour on urgent occasions, have no time to explore the terrain or to study the habits of mind of the foreign court or to create the necessary liaisons or to change the course of events already in flood.’¹

I submit that these words have a direct application to the situation between Canada and the United States. If we are to transact our business with our neighbours satisfactorily, we must be in constant touch with them, ever ready to understand their point of view and to explain our own. Our object should be so to conduct our relations that acute difficulties may not arise ; we must endeavour to preserve a good understanding rather than seek to preserve the peace after actual difficulties have arisen.

It is urged, by way of objection, that Australia and the other Dominions will wish to follow our

¹ *The Practice of Diplomacy* being an English rendering of François de Callières, *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains*, presented with an introduction by A. F. Whyte (Constable, 1919), p. 13.

example. If the conditions were the same there could be no reasonable objection to their doing so, but the conditions are not comparable and never can be comparable.

I have dwelt on this matter because of the vital relation it bears to Canada's position in the Britannic Commonwealth and her effort to promote and maintain a good understanding between the English-speaking peoples of the world. One must recognize, however, that there are real patriots who are doubtful about the expediency of the step, just as Lord Stanley was doubtful of the expediency of granting responsible government in 1844. They argue that constitutional theory and practice are against it. The answer is, the British Empire has not been built up on constitutional theory, it has not been developed on theoretical lines. Its development has been in accordance with the actual needs of the hour and the conditions which faced its people in different quarters of the globe. What we require in the present situation is to adopt practical plans to meet an actual situation rather than permit ourselves to be diverted from doing that which needs to be done because it is not in harmony with certain theories of constitutional practice which have prevailed in the past. The British Empire itself is contrary to all theories of government. There has never been anything like it in human history. There is no standard by which we can judge it.

There is no rule by which we can measure it, and there is no limit we can place on its future and the service it may render humanity if its leaders of to-day are as wise and practical in meeting each exigency as it arises as have been its leaders in the past.

Repre-
sentation
in
London.

The change in Canada's status in the Britannic Commonwealth and her membership in the League of Nations require a change in the form of representation in London. The following is suggested as one possible method of meeting the situation,

We are represented in London by our High Commissioner. The office was created many years ago, while Canada's status was simply that of a self-governing Colony, to perform certain duties applicable to our then status—duties of a very different character from those usually associated in diplomatic practice with the post of High Commissioner. Has not the time arrived when the status and duties of our High Commissioner should more nearly correspond to the present status of Canada? Are there not very cogent reasons for the change?

It is important in the interests of Canada and her place in the League of Nations that there should be a measure of continuity in her representation at the Assembly and other international gatherings or conferences held under the auspices of the League. It would be of real value to Canada if one, at least, of her representatives

knew and understood the point of view of the other nations represented in the League. The personal equation is an important factor. Under the conditions of government in Canada it is not possible to send the same representatives from Canada to each of these meetings. It may be difficult at times to send any representatives from Canada of the same standing as the representatives of other countries, and it is of the utmost importance that we should maintain a high standard of representation. The High Commissioner, if given the status and if his office were organized for the purpose, might be one of the representatives of Canada at all gatherings of the League. At important gatherings where a Canadian Minister was able to attend, the High Commissioner might be one of his colleagues or advisers, but, whoever might be the direct representative of the Canadian Government appointed to Geneva, he would have at his side a man who had been present at all the different gatherings, who knew the point of view of the different Governments represented, and who was personally acquainted with the representatives of these Governments. If Canada is to maintain her position in the League these considerations should not be overlooked.

We must also recognize that, while we have separate representation in the League, we are also part of the Britannic Commonwealth, and it is important that on grave questions of international

policy which may come up for consideration from time to time by the Council and the Assembly, no member of the Commonwealth should take a position which may affect the Commonwealth as a whole, without full information and full discussion with the other members of the Commonwealth, so as to arrive, if possible, at common ground. While the final decisions must be made by the several Governments concerned, London is the natural place for the preliminary conversations, because London is the only centre where all these Governments are represented. The High Commissioner might represent Canada at these conversations and keep his Government constantly advised concerning them.

In recent years, apart from the correspondence which takes place between the Government of Canada and the Government of Great Britain in reference to matters of Imperial or international concern, Canadian Ministers have found it necessary to go to London every year for conferences with the Government of Great Britain. It will not be possible, and it is not desirable, to dispense entirely with these conferences, but conditions of government in Canada require that they should not be too numerous, and, in any case, the questions arising are too important to be left to occasional conferences or to correspondence. Does not Canada's position now entitle her to request that her High Commissioner should deal

directly with the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs? The accredited representative of any foreign State in London has the right to discuss a matter affecting his State with the Secretary of State. How much more should the accredited representatives of one of the Dominions possess this right? One is confident that the British Government would be prepared to meet the views of the Dominions in this matter. It is quite true that during the war, and since, the High Commissioner has been called upon to perform some of the duties I have mentioned, but these are not at the present time his recognized functions, either in Canada or in Great Britain, and if we are to place on him the responsibility for the discharge of these high political duties, then the whole question of his status and duties should be carefully reviewed and the office organized to meet the new conditions.

CHAPTER XI

CANADA'S DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE

Canada
and Dis-
arma-
ment.

WHAT direct contribution has been made by Canada, as one of the nations of the Britannic Commonwealth, to international peace? The question may be considered under three aspects: (1) Limitation of Armaments; (2) International Arbitration; and (3) The International Joint Commission.

Rush-
Bagot
Agree-
ment.

Disarmament: Canada's contribution to the problem of Disarmament or the Limitation of Armaments is worthy of note.

The agreement between Great Britain and the United States for the limitation of naval armaments on the Great Lakes was formally entered into on the 28th of April 1817, and proclaimed by the President of the United States on the 28th of April 1818. It provides 'that the naval forces to be maintained upon the American Lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is:

On Lake Ontario to one vessel not exceeding one hundred tons burthen and armed with one eighteen-pound cannon.

On the Upper Lakes to two vessels not

exceeding like burthen each and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain to one vessel not exceeding like burthen and armed with like force.'

It further provides 'that all other armed vessels on these Lakes shall be forthwith dismantled and that no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed'.

It was agreed that either party might annul the agreement on giving six months' prior notice to that effect.

The reason which induced the negotiators to come to this agreement was that an armed peace upon the Lakes would operate as a continual stimulus of suspicion and ill will.

While this agreement was negotiated by Great Britain, as Canada was not then a self-governing colony, the Treaty provides that it may be denounced by either party on six months' notice, and since Canada has attained self-government she might, if she had differed from the policy embodied in the Treaty, have made representations that the Treaty should be denounced, but Canada's whole history and attitude are in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, and its provisions have been maintained by both countries, to their great mutual advantage. The success of this experiment demonstrates the possibility of success on a much larger scale.

Land
Forces.

Canada has dealt with her land forces in a manner not less noteworthy. While she has upon her Statute books a Militia and Defence Act, under which those who volunteer for militia service receive a limited annual training, she has never considered it necessary to maintain a substantial permanent force. Canada's permanent force before the war was only about 3,000 men. During the war we had on active service in Canada, Great Britain, and France, over 400,000 men. To-day our permanent force does not exceed 4,000 men. Canada maintains a smaller permanent force, having regard to her territory and population, and has a smaller *per capita* expenditure, than any country with which she can be reasonably compared. The most recent figures compiled by the Department of Militia and Defence in May of the year 1921 are as shown on p. 199.

A comparison of the military expenditure of Canada with the other members of the Commonwealth, or with other States which did not enter into the war, shows how relatively small our contribution is.

Canada has also carried out the spirit of the Rush-Bagot Convention in her land defences, and she has not found it necessary to erect forts or defensive fortifications along the common boundary line of 5,400 miles. She has found that once the principle has been accepted as between herself and her great neighbour that disputes shall be settled

STATEMENT SHOWING EXPENDITURE ON DEFENCE BY THE PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD FOR WHICH FIGURES ARE AVAILABLE

	Population.	Military. \$	Naval. \$	Air. \$	Total. \$	Per Capita. \$
Canada	9,000,000 ¹	11,890,000	2,500,000	825,000	15,215,000	1.69 (1)
Australia	5,000,000	13,874,998	14,062,500	2,700,000	30,637,498	6.13 (4)
New Zealand	1,200,000	2,876,638	1,688,499	—	4,565,137	3.80 (2)
Union of South Africa	1,276,242 ²	—	—	—	7,089,619	5.55 (3)
United Kingdom	45,000,000	477,000,000	371,155,500	85,650,300	933,805,800	20.74 (5)
Japan	57,070,936	639,275,503 ⁴	644,515,731	95,000,000	272,141,500	4.77 ³
United States	105,000,000	13,500,000	9,020,749	—	1,378,791,234	13.13
Argentine Republic	8,279,159	36,846,864	17,081,963	—	22,520,749	2.72
Brazil	27,000,000	14,225,000	6,000,000 ¹	—	53,928,827	2.00
Chile	3,945,538	21,250,000	8,250,000	12,500	20,225,000	5.06
Denmark	2,921,000	16,210,228	—	—	29,512,500	10.10 ³
Netherlands (Holland)	6,778,699	8,730,000	3,803,975	—	16,210,228	2.04
Norway	2,632,010	44,228,346	12,803,803	—	12,535,975	4.76
Portugal	5,957,985	29,841,916 ⁶	20,541,564 ⁷	—	57,032,149	9.58
Spain	20,719,598	67,428,914 ⁸	14,095,930 ⁸	—	50,583,480	2.43
Sweden	5,813,850	8,689,450	Nil	—	81,524,844	14.03
Switzerland	3,937,000	—	—	—	8,689,450	2.20

¹ Estimated.

² Whites only.

³ Exact figures for Japan are difficult to obtain.

⁴ Exclusive of expenditure by individual States on State Militias (National Guard).

⁵ It is possible that the figures for Denmark are inflated by reason of mobilization of considerable bodies of troops for duty in Plesbiscite Zone in Schleswig-Holstein.

⁶ Exclusive of \$18,852,556 budgeted for military activities in Morocco.

⁷ Includes one-sixth of a building programme of \$50,000,000 to be spread over six years.

⁸ Figures for Sweden include special expenditures for defence amounting to (i) Military \$33,923,739 and (ii) Naval \$5,534,030.

Normal figures for France and Italy are not available.

The average expenditure, *per capita*, for the above-named countries, exclusive of Canada, works out at \$6.88.

by peaceable means rather than by the arbitrament of war, an unguarded frontier of 5,400 miles is compatible with the highest interests of national safety.

That very limited works of defence and a very small permanent force are not inconsistent with the highest efficiency and the greatest effort in a national emergency is shown by the part Canada took in the last war.

Naval
defence.

While by the Rush-Bagot Treaty armed vessels have been kept off the Great Lakes, Canada has not so far maintained a navy of any strength upon either the Atlantic or Pacific Coasts. Our expanding trade, our developing merchant marine, and our naval defence have been provided for us by a navy paid for by the taxpayers of Great Britain.

While the Canadian people, I am sure, sympathize, and deeply sympathize, with the movement for the limitation of naval armaments and earnestly prayed for the success of the Washington Conference, we must recognize that even if the most sanguine hopes in reference to the Conference are realized, even if the most advanced proposals are fully accepted, it is still contemplated, and it will still be necessary for the Britannic Commonwealth to maintain a substantial naval force for purely defensive purposes and to assist in preserving the freedom of the seas as highways for commerce and for communication. How can Canada honourably claim the status of a nation and not be prepared

to discharge a nation's obligations and responsibilities in peace as well as in war ?

At the subsidiary Naval Conference held in London in 1909 between Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, a basis for the development of Canadian and Australian naval forces was worked out. I believe this Conference reached wise and sound conclusions. The Naval Service Act of 1910 was passed to give effect to the conclusions arrived at at the 1909 Conference. It was legislation required to meet the needs and to discharge the responsibilities of Canada, and under this Act certain naval training ships were acquired and a naval college established.

At the Imperial Conference of 1911 the representatives of Great Britain, Canada, and Australia worked out a plan for the co-operation of the fleet of the Empire, both in peace and in war. This plan recognized the autonomy of the Dominions and their right to control their own fleets. It delimited the areas upon the high seas on which Australia and Canada should fly the flag, protect the commerce, and preserve the trade routes of the Empire. It assigned to Australia a portion of the Southern Pacific adjacent to the Commonwealth of Australia. It gave Canada the west half of the North Atlantic and the east half of the North Pacific. It provided in time of war that as soon as the Dominions placed their fleets at the disposal of the Admiralty these fleets remained at the

disposal of the Admiralty until the war was ended. Unity in command and control was thus secured.

Differences of opinion in 1912 as to the naval policy which Canada should pursue prevented any substantial progress in the matter of naval defence, either by way of the construction or purchase of ships for a Canadian navy or by way of contribution to the British Navy. During the Imperial Conference of 1918 the policy of one central Navy for the whole Empire was definitely and finally rejected by the Prime Ministers of the Dominions, and the policy of local naval forces working in co-operation was unanimously approved. During the year 1920 certain ships were accepted by Canada from the Admiralty to form part of the Canadian naval force established under the Naval Service Act of 1910.

When the Disarmament Conference has concluded its labours and its conclusions have been ratified by all the Governments concerned, Canada should be prepared to consider what the strength of her naval force should be for the protection of her coasts, of her commerce, and of her vital interests as one of the nations of the British Commonwealth. Such action will not be to increase naval armaments, but it will enable us as self-respecting citizens to feel that we are paying our own way and not imposing upon the more heavily taxed citizens of Great Britain. We should not expect the taxpayers of Great Britain

to pay for the naval defence of Canada and of our shipping upon the high seas.

For more than one hundred years all disputes arising between Canada and the United States, on a boundary which now extends for 5,400 miles, have been settled by peaceable means. I shall only mention three of these disputes : (1) The Behring Sea Fisheries (1893), affecting the property and rights of citizens of Canada residing in British Columbia ; (2) The Alaskan Boundary (1903), affecting the boundary between Alaska and the Yukon and what were considered at the time the great gold-mining rights in these territories ; and (3) The Atlantic Fisheries (1909), affecting the rights and interests of the fishermen on our Atlantic seaboard.

International
arbitra-
tion.

These questions are of a character which in the past and in other quarters of the globe has led to international strife, but these and all others have been settled by peaceable means. It is true that not all these settlements have been accepted with unanimity in either country, but who will not concede that the settlement he least likes is vastly better and more in the interests of the nation as a whole than any settlement that could possibly have been secured by war ?

Not only have these grave disputes been settled by peaceable means, but in 1909 Canada and the United States concluded a Convention providing for the appointment of an International Joint

The
Internat-
ional
Joint
Commis-
sion.

Commission, composed of three members from each country and for the settlement by this Commission of all disputes relating to boundary waters and all other matters arising along the common frontier. The Convention also provided that by consent of the two Governments any other matter of difference arising between the two nations might be referred to the Commission for investigation and report. As you are aware, this International Joint Commission has already dealt with a number of important questions arising between Canada and the United States. It has recently settled a grave matter of controversy between the two countries relating to the use for irrigation purposes of the waters of the St. Mary and Milk Rivers which cross and re-cross the international boundary in Western Canada.

The Commission is now investigating the question of the improvement, under international agreement for navigation and power purposes, of the St. Lawrence River, one of the great waterways of the world, carrying the commerce of Western Canada and of the Middle West of the United States to the Atlantic seaboard. The transportation questions involved are of the greatest importance to the two countries, and the power development proposed will vitally affect the industrial future of the areas tributary to the river. The establishment of this Commission was a great achievement and should mark a new era in

the relations between the United States and Canada. May one express the earnest hope that the Commission will be strengthened in status and that no Government on either side will ever allow its prestige to decline ?

One may question if the people of either country appreciate the full significance and importance of the Convention establishing this International Joint Commission. It has provided a method for the settlement of disputes between the United States and Canada not dissimilar from that provided in the Covenant of the League of Nations for the settlement of questions arising between all members of the League.

While Canada's disposition has been in favour of the peaceable settlement of international disputes, this attitude has not impaired the vitality, the courage, or patriotism of her people. When in 1914 the military autocracy of Germany plunged the world into war, the Canadian people sensed the magnitude and importance of the issues. Democracy and human liberty were in peril, and without counting the cost Canada contributed her best to re-establish peace, justice, and liberty in the world.

Does the character of the Canadian people contribute toward Canada's playing a worthy part in international affairs ? We all recognize that racial differences and racial bitterness give rise to international misunderstandings, provoke international ill will, and make the preservation of peace difficult, if not impossible.

The
racial
problem.

Even the German Emperor and all his War Lords could not have carried a united German people into the war had they not for years sedulously cultivated in the minds of the German people the idea that a conflict between the Teuton and the Slav was inevitable, and that they must be prepared to fight for the preservation of German 'Kultur' against Slavic aggression. When the hour came for Germany to strike, the ground had been thoroughly prepared and the Kaiser carried a united German people into the war.

One of the most urgent needs in the world to-day is a cessation of racial bitterness and an honest and earnest effort on the part of the people of every nation to understand the point of view of the other nations. We may welcome or regret the diversity of races in Canada, we may recognize that it adds greatly to the difficulties of government, but we cannot change the facts. We may magnify racial differences and stir up racial strife, thus disturbing our own internal peace and disqualifying ourselves from taking the broader view necessary to a sympathetic understanding of international questions, or we may take full advantage of the opportunity Providence has placed within our reach of developing habits of racial co-operation. Having two Mother Countries, Great Britain and France, and with the great majority of our people of either British or French stock, we have the opportunity of studying and endeavouring to understand and

appreciate each other's point of view. It is not necessary, in order to appreciate the standpoint of the other, that we should accept it. We can respect the view of those who differ from us. One of the great objectives of the leaders of public opinion in Canada should be to develop and maintain a spirit of sympathy and co-operation between Canadians of different racial origin, not only for the sake of our own internal peace, but for the sake of the position and attitude we should adopt on international questions. This diversity of racial origin in our people and the consideration which it has compelled public men to give to the varying points of view of different racial strains in our population have already appreciably affected the attitude of our public men on Imperial and international questions. They are more tolerant of those who differ from them and they speak with a greater sense of responsibility. This is equally true of the statesmen of South Africa, who face a similar problem. This has been noticeable in the meetings of the Imperial Conference.

Some ask why should Canada concern herself with Imperial and international affairs and the problems of world peace. Are not her domestic tasks sufficiently large and urgent to absorb all her thoughts? They are large; they are urgent. Why are they so large? Why are they so urgent? Because trouble in the Balkans set the world in flames. Canada has made a much larger invest-

ment in world peace than in any other single enterprise or cause ; larger, immeasurably larger, than in her more than 20,000 miles of National Railways. She has given the lives of over 60,000 of the bravest and best of her young manhood ; she has given the strength and energy of tens of thousands more who have come back maimed or broken from the struggle ; she has placed upon her shoulders a burden of debt, the interest upon which her children and her children's children will be called upon to pay. What were the causes for which she made this great investment ? They were the supreme causes of liberty and peace. We owe it to both the living and the dead to devote our best energies toward endeavouring to preserve the peace they sacrificed so much to secure.

Canada's
contribution in
the
future.

What contribution can Canada make to the cause of peace, justice, and human progress ?

It is true that while Canada is great in extent of territory, she is not great in her present population. But the greatest contributions to human welfare have not always been made by the largest nations. In fact, size has never been the measure of the nation's contribution. Other nations much smaller than Canada have made very great contributions and these, rather than any material achievements, have determined their place in history. What shall determine ours ? Have we any definite idea or objective toward which we are consciously

aiming as we are entering into the larger life of the world ?

During the past one hundred years Canada and the United States have demonstrated that it is practicable for nations living side by side to settle all their disputes by peaceable means, even though such disputes affect territory and so-called questions of national honour. They have also proved that it is beneficial to both nations so to settle them.

During the past one hundred years Canada and the United States have also demonstrated that it is possible for nations having a common frontier of 5,400 miles strictly to limit naval and land forces and military fortifications ; that such a limitation promotes the spirit of peace, and greatly reduces the military burdens of both countries.

The best contribution Canada can make at the present time to the cause of peace and of human progress is the testimony based on over a century of experience, that the limitation of both naval and land forces by neighbouring nations contributes to peace and a good understanding between them, and is compatible with the highest interests of national safety ; and that all disputes between nations can be settled by reason rather than by force, and that both national interests and national honour will be best served by so settling them.

Canada stands for the new spirit in international relations ; she stands for the substitution of

international co-operation in the preservation of peace for international competition in preparation for war.

May I in closing commend to the student body a simple non-partisan political creed, of five articles for which we can all stand, and for which we should all work.

(1) The establishment and maintenance of the spirit of Canadian national unity as opposed to sectionalism, whether racial, religious, geographical, or occupational.

(2) The establishment and maintenance of co-operation between capital and labour on a just and equitable basis as opposed to class domination on the one hand or class conflict on the other.

(3) The maintenance of the full equality of status of the members of the Britannic Commonwealth, and the preservation of the unity essential to the strength and security of the whole.

(4) The maintenance of the most cordial relations between the Britannic Commonwealth and the United States of America and the recognition of Canada's position as an interpreter and reconciler between the two.

(5) The maintenance of wholehearted co-operation with the League of Nations as the most hopeful and practical experiment so far devised for providing a substitute for war as a means of settling international disputes and for promoting international co-operation and peace.

PART IV

THE CHURCH AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER XII

THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

THERE can be no permanent peace unless the spirit of peace finds an abiding place in the hearts of men. The movement among Governments must be inspired and sustained by a great growth of the spirit of peace among the masses of mankind ; not the peace of stagnation nor the peace of oppression, but the peace of justice.

The
Prince of
Peace.

The first Christian note ever struck was a note of peace and goodwill. It heralded the birth of the Prince of Peace. It was both a testimony and a prophecy—a testimony to His mission and a prophecy of His final triumph. But the Church has not always struck this note, and both the Church and the world have suffered in consequence.

At the time of the birth of Christ the Roman Empire dominated the world, but side by side with the formal unity brought about by the extension of its sway there was a strong nationalism on the part of some of its subject peoples.

The Jews were the most conspicuous example. They had not only resisted all attempts to destroy their nationality, but amid all the adversities which befell them they cherished the hope of regaining their national independence and finally of world dominion. Had not the prophets foretold the supremacy of Israel? Their national exclusiveness is illustrated throughout Jewish history. It was in such an intensely nationalistic atmosphere that Jesus of Nazareth was born and lived His life. That He was an ardent patriot is shown by His lament over the impending fate of Jerusalem, but His horizon was not limited to national boundaries nor His sympathies to the Jewish people. He gave an entirely new interpretation to the Old Testament prophecies and proclaimed a spiritual and not a temporal kingdom. He gave to our humanity a new conception of human relationships, that of the solidarity of the race and of the universal brotherhood of man. Even His closest followers and friends found it difficult to understand and appreciate the new teaching or to look beyond the narrow nationalism which dominated their lives. It was difficult for even the Church in Jerusalem to realize 'that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him'.

St Paul. The Apostle Paul caught the larger vision and became the chief interpreter and exponent of the

new Gospel to the other nations of the world. His bold proclamation that God 'hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth',¹ and that 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female',² was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness, but to our humanity the saving gospel of life and hope. Notwithstanding the bitter persecution from Jew and Gentile alike, this gospel of human brotherhood won its way in all lands and among all peoples until it became the greatest unifying force in a disturbed and distracted world.

Christianity is not nationalistic but universal in its outlook, and it was in the proclamation of this world-wide gospel of human brotherhood that the Church won her great triumphs in the early centuries of the Christian faith; and while the Roman Empire, which was the visible symbol of the unity of humanity, was breaking up, this new power making for unity was rapidly extending its sway over the minds and hearts of men. It was in the year A.D. 426 that St. Augustine published his *De Civitate Dei*. He suggested that there was growing up within the outworn framework of the Roman Empire a new community 'united by the common belief of its members in the Christian faith and by their common and

St. Augustine.

¹ Acts xvii. 26.

² Gal. iii. 28.

spontaneous allegiance to the Christian law'. This new community aimed at nothing less than the dominion of the world, but it was a spiritual dominion—a union of hearts in loyal devotion to their spiritual head and in willing service to mankind. This great conception of St. Augustine appears to have been the starting-point of mediæval speculation on a World State—men sought to express this conception in the political organization of society, with the result, first, of the Holy Roman Empire; and, secondly, of the temporal power of the Papacy. It is not our purpose to trace the conflict which developed between these two powers, each claiming world dominion, but to point out that in delimitation of the theory of the Divine Right of the Pope there was developed another theory of government—the Divine Right of the civil power, as illustrated by the Divine Right of Kings.

The
Coming
of Islam.

While this conflict was being waged a new power had arisen to challenge the spiritual supremacy of the Christian Church and the political power of Christian rulers. Mohammedanism, which, like Judaism and Christianity, was the gift of the Semitic Race to the world, was essentially a militant religion. With the followers of Islam the Church and State were one and they made their converts at the point of the sword. The extension of the military power of Islam meant an increase in the number of converts to

the Moslem faith. That extension was remarkably rapid. Mahomet died in A.D. 632. By A.D. 641 Egypt had been conquered; the Atlantic was reached in 708; in 711 Spain was invaded and conquered; and by 732 the Moslem armies had advanced past Bordeaux and Tours to meet Charles Martel on the bloody field of Poitiers, where the Crescent was compelled to retire beyond the Pyrenees. In the East similar success marked the advance of Moslem power, though the conflict was more prolonged. In 636 East Persia was overrun and the Moslem advance extended to the frontiers of China. By 711 the Indus had been passed and Sind and Multan subdued. Thus the Mohammedan power was introduced into India and for centuries it was to be dominant over the greater part of India. To-day the Moslem faith is one of the most vital factors in the problem of the government of India and the East. In 1099 Jerusalem was captured and the Holy Places defiled, but for two centuries Palestine continued to be the battle ground of the Crescent and the Cross. Constantinople was first attacked in 716, but for seven hundred years it was able to roll back the besiegers and to be the bulwark of Christianity on the Bosphorus. But the militant religion of Mohammed moved forward—Constantinople was conquered in 1453; the area of Christendom was steadily shrinking, and it was not until the heroic defence of Vienna in 1529

that the victorious advance of the Moslem was stayed. Under the powerful impact of the forces of the Prophet there were developed two worlds and two centres of world unity—one Christian, the other Moslem.

The
Military
Retreat
of Islam.

For over three hundred years the military and political power of Islam has been steadily declining, the culmination being the collapse of the Turkish Empire at the end of the last war, but there has been no corresponding decline in its religious enthusiasm or in its missionary zeal. In devotion to his faith the Moslem sets an example which the Christian would do well to imitate. To-day the world is witnessing a great Islamic revival and a pan-Islamic movement, which in Africa are making notable conquests for the faith, and which, in India at least, under the name of the Caliphate movement, have real political objectives. One may well doubt whether the Western world has yet realized the vitality or magnitude of the movement. So far as this is political it is a question for Governments to deal with ; but in so far as it is religious, and it is largely religious, Governments must not interfere. Religious liberty is as sacred to the Moslem as to the Christian and should be as jealously guarded. In any case force will not settle a question of faith. It has been tried many times ; it has always failed.

But crusading was not to be confined to efforts against Islam ; the Church having drawn the

sword against the infidel now turned it against the heretic. Before the defeat of the Moslem power at Vienna in 1529 the wars of religion had already commenced in Europe. The association of the temporal and spiritual power meant that he who did not believe as the State decreed was considered as disloyal to the State and its institutions, and for more than one hundred years following the siege of Vienna religious wars distracted Europe and drenched many of its countries in blood. Cruel and bloody as many of these wars were, they resulted in a new political and social order and the freedom of the human spirit, which are among our most priceless possessions to-day.

‘To transfer the allegiance of the human spirit from clerical to civil authority was, roughly speaking, the effect of the movement of the sixteenth century, alike in Catholic and Protestant countries.’¹ The Reformation intensified the belief in the inherent sanctity of civil government in the form of the Divine Right of Kings. What was it that counteracted the evil effects of this theory? As a result of the Reformation the sovereign was sometimes an adherent of a different confession from that of his subjects and this at once operated as a check upon monarchical tyranny. Religious liberty arose out of the determination of the people not to submit to political or religious

The
Reforma-
tion.

¹ Rev. J. Neville Figgis, in *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. iii, p. 738.

persecution from their rulers because of their religious faith. Political liberty grew out of religious liberty, the refusal of peoples of one faith to be merged in other communities or communions. 'It was only the religious earnestness, the confessional conflicts, and the persecuting spirit of the sixteenth century, that kept alive political liberty, and saved it from a collapse more universal than that which befell Republican ideals at the beginning of the Roman Empire.'¹ It was out of this conflict between sovereign and subject that we to-day have the combination of liberty with order, which is one of our most cherished possessions and one of the best guarantees of domestic peace.

Reviewing the history of the Christian Church, one of the outstanding lessons is that just in so far as the Church succeeded in dominating the civil power and using it for its purposes, or the civil power succeeded in dominating the Church and using it for its purposes, the Church lost its moral authority and its spiritual power. The lesson of history is that the Church should rely only on her spiritual resources for the achievement of her tasks. 'My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight. . . . Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should

¹ s.c., p. 769.

bear witness unto the truth.' ¹ To bear witness unto the truth is the supreme mission of His Church.

It is the missionary movement which has Missions. brought the Church back to the conception and the spirit of St. Augustine, a conception and a spirit which he derived from the New Testament, and which transcend all national boundaries, and recognize as brothers the men of every race no matter what their colour, their faith, or their stage of civilization.

It is only the world-wide acceptance of this conception of the solidarity of the race and of universal brotherhood that can provide a sure and enduring basis for World Peace. Important and influential as may be the Governments of the Great Powers in promoting and preserving peace, important as may be the League of Nations in promoting and preserving peace, important as may be the British Empire in preserving peace and stability in the world, the Church, because of her universal appeal to the human spirit, should be still more influential and important.

In the previous lectures I have pointed out how difficult, and in some aspects how menacing, is the racial problem to the peace of the world. That problem can never be solved by civil power alone, and it is toward its solution that the

¹ John xviii. 36, 37.

modern missionary movement has made one of its greatest contributions. What other movement during the past century has done so much toward breaking down racial barriers between East and West? There is so much that is unworthy and ignoble in our Western civilization which finds its way to the East that, were it not for the work of Christian missionaries, the racial prejudices which exist to-day would have been greatly intensified. The modern missionary movement has gone to China, Japan, and India, with its hospitals for the care and treatment of the sick, with its schools for the education of the children and the youth, with its printing presses for the distribution of literature, and with a spirit of unselfish altruism which has mitigated if it has not altogether counterbalanced the evil effects of the contact of other phases of our Western civilization, and has given back to the East that great conception of human brotherhood which Jesus of Nazareth, that son of the Semitic race, gave to our humanity. Viscount Chinda, at one time Japanese Ambassador to the United States, summed up the situation when he said—‘The Christian missionaries to Japan contributed to the building up of an unseen bridge between the East and West.’

Mr. Wellington Koo, who is the representative of China on the Council of the League of Nations and who is also one of the Chinese delegates to

the Disarmament Conference at Washington, speaking at the University of Chicago a year or two ago, said, 'Nothing which individual Americans have done in China has more strongly impressed Chinese minds with the sincerity, the genuineness, the altruism of American friendship for China than the spirit of service and sacrifice . . . demonstrated by American missionaries.'

These two testimonials from China and Japan illustrate better than any arguments the contribution which the Church has made toward this better understanding. Many of the people of the East have gained their first impressions of the West and Western civilization from the Christian missionary; and while there may be criticism of certain aspects of missionary effort, the whole contact of the missionary enterprise with the peoples of the East has been to increase their respect for and appreciation of the people and civilization of the West. On the other hand, the missionary organizations in the Home Land and the returned and native missionaries have been the interpreters to the masses at home of the life and spirit and characteristics of the peoples of the East. Though some of these interpretations may not represent the people of the East as they would like to be represented, they are all genuinely sympathetic, and they stimulate interest and sympathy between the peoples of the West and of the East, and help to bridge the gulf which

racial divisions create and which racial animosities would widen.

Speaking broadly, the missionary has been not only the exponent but the principal incarnation of the spirit of human brotherhood to the Eastern nations. In hospitals for the sick, in orphanages for the children, in relief measures in times of famine and of plague, the Christian missionary has gone about in the spirit of his Master, doing good, relieving distress, counting his life not dear unto himself that he might help some, even the weakest and most humble. In times of persecution and of grave trial he has proved his devotion to the cause he served and has sealed his faith with his blood. To-day tens of thousands of people in Eastern lands have a new and finer conception of the spirit of human brotherhood and of the people of the West than could possibly have been entertained but for the work of the missionary.

In addition, the missionary enterprise has contributed and is contributing greatly to the development of native leaders in Eastern lands. Many of the distinguished men in responsible public positions and in commercial and financial enterprises have received their education in the schools and colleges established by missionary organizations and in the wholesome atmosphere of a Christian environment. What is to be the future of China where dwells one-fourth of the whole human race? If China could be organized and militarized in the

next fifty years to the extent Japan has been in the past half-century, the German Empire under the Kaiser would be a weak military organization compared to China, and our whole Western civilization would be in jeopardy. Japan during the past fifty years but followed the example of so-called Christian Powers. What example will these nations set China during the next fifty years? The future of China will be greatly influenced by their example. If she finds she can only secure justice by force, and if her place among the nations is to be determined by her military strength, why should she not follow where Japan has led? Her difficulties at the present are great beyond description, but China can afford to take time to solve them if the Powers give her the opportunity. Her greatest need is strong, courageous leadership by men with a high sense of responsibility, and the schools and universities founded by the Christian Church in China are helping to provide this leadership, but much more can and should be done.

We must not overlook the effect of the growth of nationalist sentiment upon the missionary enterprise of the Church, a sentiment which resents foreign control in religious and educational work almost as strongly as it resents foreign domination in matters of government. One must recognize the powerful impulse of the Nationalist movement, and the missionary leaders are not

National-
ism and
Missions.

unmindful of it. They are sympathetic with the aspirations of the people and are seeking to be of the greatest assistance in leading the native Churches along the lines of self-support and self-government. The Churches in Eastern lands must become truly national in the sense that they must become the Churches of the people. The peoples of the East can and will make an invaluable contribution to Christian thought and idealism, and the Churches of the East, when fully developed, should give appropriate expression to the Christian thought and character of Eastern peoples.

The
White
Races
and the
Black.

The racial problem is not confined to the relations between the white and yellow races—it also includes the relations between the white and the black. There are two possible courses open. One—the domination of the black by the white, which means, in countries where the black is numerically many times stronger than the white, that in time the domination can only be maintained by force. The other—the truly Christian view—that the black, even though just emerging from barbarism, as he is in Africa, is still a human being, a member of the great human brotherhood, and that the races which have enjoyed the privileges of Christian civilization for centuries are under obligation to their less fortunate brothers to endeavour, patiently and yet seriously, to educate them for useful occupations and pursuits, so that, in time, they may become useful

members of organized society, and take their part as citizens of the country in which they live. This view is strongly held by the more progressive students of the problem. So far as Africa is concerned, one must recognize that tribes which have been separated in the past by tribal differences and feuds have been brought together by the white man for his profit. In the mines of Johannesburg, in the various industrial centres of Africa, the white man has brought the black from every quarter of Africa to work for him. Working together, they have seen and learned that the differences which divided them as tribes are small and insignificant compared with the gulf which separates them from the white man, which to them may well appear impassable. Not only is there a colour bar, which completely separates them from men of European stock in the entire organization of society, but there is also a colour bar in the ranks of labour itself, and no matter how efficient the black man may prove he cannot rise above a certain grade of employment. There is now growing up among the African peoples a real racial consciousness, the feeling of brotherhood of black with black, a real determination that they will act together when the time comes. People laugh at the Pan-African Conference ; it meets once a year and passes resolutions ; it may not amount to much, but it expresses a very real idea, viz. the solidarity

of the black race, and the time has come when the world should recognize that this racial consciousness of the black man is a force which must be reckoned with.

One believes that truly progressive people realize that, so far as Africa is concerned, permanent white domination in the sense of holding the black down by force is not a feasible proposition. All the black has to do is to stop work and the whole industrial organization is paralysed. Thoughtful and far-sighted people recognize that there is only one way out and that is the way of the spirit of brotherhood, and the recognition by those who know the benefits of Christian civilization, of their obligations to their less fortunate brothers. Training a race is a very slow process. It will take a long time to train the black to take his place in organized society in Africa, though what has been accomplished by a few is proof of what can be accomplished in time by the many. We should not forget that it has taken many centuries to bring us to where we now are, and we cannot boast of our present conditions.

I believe that up to this time approximately ninety per cent. of all the education, industrial as well as literary, which the black peoples of Africa have received, has been received at the hands of the Christian Churches through the

missionary organizations.¹ It may be that in some cases the education has not been the best adapted to the actual needs and requirements of the people in their own local community, but nevertheless it has been an honest and faithful effort to express to these less favoured ones the spirit of the life and teaching of the common Lord of both black and white, and in these trying days when racial feeling is running high and racial difficulties may be apprehended, the faithful work of the Christian missionary should count for much. Men like Livingstone and Moffat and their successors have made humanity their debtor by their life and work in Africa.

To sum up, may one express the conviction that the Church, through the missionary enterprise, has, amid great difficulties and discouragements, made a greater and more permanent contribution to a good understanding between the East and West and between the White and Black races than any other single agency. But this is not enough. The Church has not made her final contribution to a good understanding between the nations. Her work has only really begun. Her greatest achievements should be in the future. The Church must wage war against racial prejudices, racial animosities, and international ill will.

¹ Some Governments have supervised the work and several have made substantial grants in aid.

She must proclaim and incarnate the spirit of justice and peace. If war is a barbarous and not a Christian method of settling disputes between nations, the Church should so proclaim it and appeal for a more humane and Christian method of settlement.

The League of Nations is a most fundamental and far-reaching change in the political organization of society. Its ideals of peace, justice, and international co-operation are the ideals of humanity, they are also the basic ideals of the Christian Church. The success of the League depends upon the public opinion of the world. There is no organized agency in Christian lands which can render a greater service in promoting those ideals and in creating that public opinion than the Church.

But something more is required of the Church. Is it not a matter for serious reflection that the great military Powers which in modern times have menaced the world's peace have been the so-called Christian Powers? They have menaced the peace, not because they were Christian but because they were not Christian enough. Surely the last great war which shook society to its foundations should shake the Church out of her self-complacency and lethargy. We require a new international ethic. We require a frank recognition that right and justice should govern the mutual relations of States

and that it is as dishonourable for a State to take advantage of a neighbouring State, either by force or by guile, as it would be for a so-called honourable citizen to take advantage of a neighbour by force or guile. This new standard can only be set up and maintained if the nations are inspired with a new spirit. Is the Church prepared to undertake this great commission given her by her Founder nearly nineteen centuries ago ?

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Industrial Revolution.

EVERY thoughtful person recognizes how unchristian in many of its aspects is our so-called Christian civilization, how little the spirit of brotherhood and service finds expression in the social and industrial organization of society, and the supreme task of the Church is so to interpret, so to incarnate this spirit of brotherhood and service as to win the allegiance of the minds and hearts of men.

Next to the racial problem the most difficult, perplexing, and menacing to World Peace is the industrial. What is the industrial problem? It is important that we should try to understand its main outlines. It may be difficult to understand—it is much more difficult to solve. The industrial problem of to-day has its roots in the past, but may I recall some of the conditions which have contributed to its development? For the purpose of this discussion we may start with the industrial revolution which followed the introduction of machinery. The introduction of machinery, which was considered, and rightly considered, as a great blessing to mankind, has entailed some very serious consequences. It transformed the

whole industrial life of the community. The work ceased to be done in the home and passed out into the factory. With the work went the workman and his family; they ceased to be manufacturers, they became wage-earners. As industry grew and inventions increased, and new methods of manufacture were developed, the factory grew, and with the growth of the factory there was a corresponding increase in the number of wage-earners.

In more recent years the standardization of product which machinery makes possible, the development of improved methods of transportation, the opening up and exploitation of new territories, the ever-growing demand for manufactured products, and the increasing competition in trade, have resulted in a great increase in the size of manufacturing operations and in the gradual elimination of the smaller manufacturers. To-day great combinations of capital in almost all forms of industrial enterprise are the distinguishing feature of the industrial order.

In the old days each craftsman constructed his own piece of work. He took a pride in the product he turned out; he put himself into it and it called forth the best that was in him. That day is gone. At a later date, in the small factory the employer and his workmen were neighbours, and each had a direct and personal interest in the welfare of the other. That day too is gone. Under our modern

industrial system the workman has ceased to be much more than a cog in the industrial machine, a commodity to be purchased at the market price ; hour after hour, day after day, week after week, he goes through exactly the same mechanical operation, making the same section or piece of work, and he has lost, to a considerable extent at least, the interest and the pride in his work which were characteristic of another day and of different conditions.

Because the worker has found himself treated as a commodity, and as simply a cog in the industrial machine, he has been compelled to organize to protect himself, and to secure better wages and better working conditions. It has been a long and in some respects a bitter fight to secure the rights of organization which he now enjoys. From time to time his programme has changed. It is different in different countries and among different groups of workers in the same country. In some countries and among some groups the working man demands the destruction of capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, in others the abolition of the wages system, while in others he still stands for the old claims of better wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions. The ever-increasing influence and power of organized labour not only in the industrial but in the political life of the country is a distinguishing characteristic of the modern industrial

order. Both capital and labour are more highly and efficiently organized than ever before.

By the specialization of product and by the utilization of a large force of labour modern industrial organization is capable of enormous production, and this has contributed to the accumulation of great wealth in the hands of the few. Professor MacIver, in his book *Labour in the Changing World* (p. 10),¹ points out that in Great Britain two-thirds of the wealth is owned by one-seventieth of the population, while in America—these figures, no doubt, apply to the United States—two-thirds is owned by one-fiftieth of the population. On the other hand, particularly in the older countries, there is a very substantial percentage of the entire population below the poverty line, a large number on the border line of poverty, and a substantial number who, whenever periods of sickness or prolonged unemployment come, are in great need if not in actual destitution and want, because they have not a sufficient reserve to meet these contingencies. Apart from any theories which one may entertain as to the organization of society, one has only to look out on the world and see the great aggregations of capital in the hands of the few, the ostentatious display some make of their wealth, and the conditions of poverty and distress among great masses of the people, to realize that these conditions alone are sufficient

¹ 1919, Dent & Sons, Toronto; Dutton & Co., New York.

and abundantly sufficient to produce general, deep-seated, and permanent industrial unrest.

Organiza-
tion of
Society.

There is another aspect to the problem even more fundamental. We live under what is described by the worker as the capitalistic organization of society. Undoubtedly under the existing industrial system capital dominates the situation and labour is more or less at its mercy. Socialism directly challenges the basis of the existing organization of society, and organized labour in many countries and under different names joins in this challenge. The Marxian Socialist demands the destruction of capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat as a step towards world-wide communism, and he declares that there can be no justice to the toiler, and no peace to the world, until capitalism is destroyed. This is a view which must be reckoned with and can only be ignored at our peril. In Great Britain there is an increasing number of Socialist Sunday Schools, in which the Marxian Socialist doctrine of the Class War is taught to the children of the workers, and a generation is growing up convinced that their welfare demands war against the other classes of society. Adult classes are also conducted on a large scale. One questions whether the employers of labour realize how general is the teaching, and how numerous the converts to Marxian Socialism.

We must also recognize that the wages system,

which to many appears to be as natural and inevitable a part of the industrial organization of society as the Ten Commandments are of the moral law, is not only challenged by large sections of organized labour, but by many of our foremost economists who have devoted their time to the study of the industrial problem. They claim that treating labour as a commodity to be paid for by wages at the market price is a denial of personality and is only another form of slavery of human beings which they call wage slavery. They claim that just as chattel slavery has gone so wage slavery must go. This view appears to be steadily gaining ground.

There was a time when the working man only demanded higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions. To-day an increasing number, even among the more conservative, deny that these are the real or the true objectives of labour. What labour demands, and they contend should have, is a real partnership in industry, that they should be no more under the power or subject to the control of capital than capital is of labour.

Throughout the labour world there is deep-seated and wide-spread unrest. Strong currents of thought and of feeling are moving labour as never before. The awful loss and wastage of the war, involving the destruction of the world's accumulated wealth, the result of man's toil for generations, the colossal burdens of war debts still

remaining to be liquidated, all call for a return to industrial stability, to a lower cost of production, and to a great increase in the productive power of labour; but labour hesitates. Labour distrusts both the sincerity of capital and of governments. The worker realized his strength during the war, and he asks himself, has not the time come to use his strength to better his condition, to prevent, if possible, the return to pre-war conditions. On the other hand, too many employers see in the present depressed condition of trade and industry an opportunity to teach labour a lesson, and on this Continent there appears to be a movement, in some influential quarters at least, to use the present period of unemployment to try to break organized labour. All these conditions and others combine to make the present industrial problem.

Labour in
the Peace
Treaties.

Whither are we drifting; what shall be the outcome? Is there any practicable solution, or do we face a class war? These are the questions thoughtful men are asking themselves. There are some facts which none will dispute. We all realize that industrial unrest is world-wide, and that this unrest is not due to the war, though in some cases it has, no doubt, been aggravated by the war. It was abundantly in evidence before the war, and the fact of its world-wide existence, and the depth of feeling which it has aroused, is proof that there is something wrong in the existing

system. Great hopes were held out to the toiler that after the war conditions would be improved and a new and better social and industrial order would be established. The Treaty of Peace contains the following declaration :

‘Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of universal peace, and such a peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice ;

‘And Whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled ; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required, as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labour supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organization of vocational and technical education and other measures ;

‘Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labour is an obstacle in the way of other nations, which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries ;

‘The High Contracting Parties moved by sentiments of justice and humanity, as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, agree to the following :

‘A permanent organization is hereby established for the promotion of the objects set forth in the preamble.’¹

International
Labour
Organization.

The permanent organization referred to is the International Labour Organization, the third meeting of which was held in 1921 in Geneva. All members of the League of Nations are members of the International Labour Organization. They have not only accepted the foregoing declaration, but the following statement of principles contained in Article 427 of the Treaty :

‘The High Contracting Parties, recognizing that the well-being, physical, moral and intellectual, of industrial wage-earners is of supreme international importance, have framed, in order to further this great end, the permanent machinery provided for in Section I and associated with that of the League of Nations.

‘They recognize that differences of climate, habits and customs, of economic opportunity and industrial tradition, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment. But, holding as they do, that labour should not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply, so far as their special circumstances will permit.

‘Among these methods and principles, the following seem to the High Contracting Parties to be of special and urgent importance :

First : The guiding principle above enunciated

¹ *Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany*, Versailles, 28 June 1919, Part XIII, sec. 1.

that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce ;

Second : The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers ;

Third : The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country ;

Fourth : The adoption of an eight hours day or a forty-eight hours week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Fifth : The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable.

Sixth : The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh : The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth : The standard set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth : Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.'

These principles have been declared to be the 'Magna Charta' of labour, but they are not the

Magna Charta unless applied. Germany has been admitted to the International Labour Organization ; but two great Powers still remain outside, the United States and Russia. The abstention of the United States, the chaotic condition of Russia, and the general economic situation throughout the world render real progress toward the application of these methods and principles slow and difficult. To add to the difficulties, Labour commences to suspect, and not without reason, that many Governments which assented to these principles at the time the Treaty was framed are not now enthusiastic to carry them out. Undoubtedly the Governments face much graver difficulties than they anticipated at the time the Treaty was executed.

Work of
the
Organi-
zation.

The declaration and principles embodied in the Treaties of Peace, and the International Labour Organization thereby created, involve a repudiation of uncontrolled and unregulated capitalism on the one hand and of the domination of labour on the other. Combined, they present an industrial policy evidencing a sincere purpose to secure co-operation between Labour, Capital, and Society, as represented by Governments, in establishing and maintaining more just and humane conditions of labour and in giving labour a greatly improved status in industry.

How is this co-operation to be established and this improved status to be secured ? The indus-

trial policy set forth in the Treaty involves co-operation not only between Capital, Labour, and the Government in each member of the International Labour Organization, but the co-operation of all these with those of every other member.

The International Labour Organization, which is associated with the League of Nations, is composed of the General Conference and the Governing Body. To illustrate their different functions the one may be referred to as the legislative and the other as the executive branch of the organization, though the term 'legislative' cannot in strictness be applied.

The Conference is composed of four representatives of each member, two representing the Government, one representing the employers, and one the workers. This is a new experiment in international conferences. The votes are not given by States but each delegate is entitled to vote and each vote has the same value. One result is that the representatives from any State may be found voting against each other on any question, and in practice this frequently happens, most of the employers' representatives voting together and most of the workers' delegates the same. The Government delegates have, therefore, the deciding vote. While these differences naturally develop in the Conference and Governing Body, it is a great advance in the relations of Labour and Capital to have their representatives meet face

to face with representatives of Governments, all engaged in an earnest endeavour to reach common ground.

The Governing Body is composed of twenty-four members, twelve representing Governments, six the employers, and six the workers. Of the twelve Government members eight represent the eight principal industrial nations of the world, such nations to be selected as provided in the Treaty, and the other four are to be chosen or elected at the General Conference. The six employers' representatives and the six workers' representatives are to be elected by the employers' and workers' delegates, respectively, at the General Conference.

It should be a matter of gratification to us, as Canadians, that at the first election to the Governing Body which took place at the Washington Conference in 1919 Canada was chosen as one of the four members entitled to name a Government representative on the Governing Body, and a Canadian Labour representative was chosen as one of the six Labour members, so that for the past three years Canada has had two members on the Governing Body.

The General Conference meets annually to consider certain specific questions set forth in the agenda, and its conclusions, which require a two-thirds vote to be approved, are embodied in draft conventions to be ratified by the members, or in

recommendations to be put into force by legislative action of the members.

The Director of the International Labour Organization, who is responsible to the Governing Body, is the administrative head of the organization, and he has under him a large staff to carry on the administrative work.

The International Labour Organization has been devoting its energies towards securing international agreement to bring into operation, where not now in force, the principles and policies set forth in the Treaty, and also to investigate industrial conditions throughout the world and to publish the result of these investigations. Several important conventions and recommendations have been agreed upon relating to hours of labour, unemployment, sickness and disability insurance, child labour, a weekly day of rest, and other kindred questions, and the publications of the International Labour Office have proved most valuable to all students of industrial conditions. It appears, however, much easier to secure agreement to these conventions and recommendations at the General Conference than to secure the necessary ratification by the members. Probably too much has been attempted, too many conventions and recommendations have been submitted to the Governments for action. Criticism has also been directed to some extent against the size and expense of the staff of the International

Labour Office at Geneva. Probably here also a less ambitious programme might have been wiser. But surveying the whole situation these are but incidents of a new and very great experiment, the greatest and most hopeful yet tried, to secure co-operation between Capital, Labour, and Governments, not only on a national but on an international scale in working toward the solution of one of the gravest problems of our time.

Every thoughtful person will recognize the difficulties of international co-operation on a world-wide scale in dealing with industrial questions, because of the great diversity of conditions under which industry is carried on, but these difficulties must be surmounted.

The
Russian
Experi-
ment.

Do the Labour clauses of the Peace Treaty fairly represent the spirit of Governments and of Labour and Capital respectively in reference to the industrial problems to-day? One cannot say that they do. Labour and Capital appear to be farther apart to-day than they were at the close of the war. What is the explanation of this condition? The answer is to be found in the inherent difficulties of the world-wide economic situation and in the action of extremists on both sides. None can deny that Labour throughout the world has suffered, and I believe unjustly suffered, because of the results of the application of Marxian Socialism in Russia, where communism has largely destroyed both industrial and agricultural produc-

tion. Lenin and Trotsky have been wise enough to reverse their policy. The Soviet Government found that the peasants declined to sow where they could not reap and enjoy the fruits of their labour, and in order to improve production, which was seriously diminished, and to avert if possible the famine which was then threatened, they reversed their communistic policy as applied to agriculture and permitted the agricultural population to return to private ownership. That was the beginning of the end. You could not have one-half of the country communistic and the other half individualistic in the ownership of property and the instruments of production. You could not have the rural sections individualistic and the cities and towns communistic. The Soviet Republic has now been compelled to take the further step and recognize private capital and private ownership in the operation of the industries of the country.

In a speech delivered by Lenin at the Pan-Russian Congress of Committees for political education at Moscow on 17th October, 1921, he made a public confession of the blunder which the Soviet Government had made in attempting to establish Communism in Russia at one step. The following is an extract from his address, referring to the refusal of the peasants to carry out the Government programme :

‘ It was during this period and on account of

this error that we suffered a severe economic defeat, after which we began a strategic retreat. So long as we were not completely beaten we had only to fall back in order to effect a complete reconstruction on a more solid basis. There is no doubt about our defeat on the economic front, and it is a very heavy defeat. We, therefore, candidly propounded the question of the new economic policy. It is natural that certain comrades are very much depressed in the face of this fact, and that they are allowing themselves to be seized by panic.

‘The attempt to introduce Communism brought on us in the Spring of 1921 on the economic front a defeat more grave than any that we had formerly suffered from Koltchak, Denikin, or Pilsudski. We then recognized that our economic policy, as it had been formulated by the organs of Government, did not at all correspond with what was going on among the masses and was incapable of restoring the forces of production ; that restoration had been hindered by the requisitions in the villages and the introduction of Communist methods in the towns. It was this policy that provoked the profound economic and political crisis that was so acute in the Spring of 1921. We have effected our retreat not without a certain amount of disorder. It is true that the positions in the rear were prepared. It is only necessary to look back to the decisions of our party in 1918 to be convinced of that. But it must be admitted that even at this moment we are falling back in a disorder that is sometimes too marked. It is that disorder that must be striven against.’

Marxian Socialism has been applied to Russia ; it has disastrously failed and in its application and

failure it has wrought untold loss and suffering to the Russian people. It has deprived the working men of their liberties, and has made them slaves of the State, and at the same time, by reason of the impoverished condition of the country, it has denied to them the just recompense of labour.¹ Marxian Socialists in other lands may repudiate the work and policy of Lenin and Trotsky as not being true to the ideals of Karl Marx, just as Lenin and Trotsky repudiate and denounce their critics as being false to that teacher. But the fact remains, the experiment was tried in Russia and it hopelessly and terribly failed.

Every lover of his kind must be deeply moved by the appalling conditions of famine and disease in Russia to-day. Had the world not been shocked so repeatedly in the past seven years the Russian situation would have stirred humanity to its depths. It is idle to spend time on disputation over the causes of the famine, while men, women, and children are dying by the thousand. The need of the hour is prompt and adequate relief. No dislike of Bolshevism or of the Soviet Government can excuse inaction, and the Christian Church should arouse the conscience of the people to adopt more adequate measures to meet the situation.

The 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' affords no solution of the grave industrial problem of our

¹ See *Labour Conditions in Soviet Russia*. Harrison; *Report of the British Labour Delegation to Russia*, Trade Union Congress.

time, and its complete failure in Russia has reacted against organized labour throughout the world. Extremists in the Labour ranks in other lands have also contributed to the present condition. Their extreme and impracticable proposals have alienated sympathy and support.

On the other hand capitalistic domination of industrial conditions, which is probably more strikingly illustrated in the United States than in any other industrial country, will not provide a solution either, and the capitalist who wholly ignores the just claims of Labour is as great a menace to just and stable peace as is the extreme Marxian Socialist.

The Inter-
Church
World
Move-
ment.

Some time ago in an important industrial centre in the United States there were very serious labour troubles. The Inter-Church World Movement conceived it to be their duty thoroughly to investigate the situation. They did so. It is claimed that a most careful and thorough investigation was made by experienced and competent investigators, and that the conclusions reached were just and sound.¹ I am not now concerned, however, with the question whether they reached the best conclusions or not—they did what they conceived to be their duty—but one is concerned with what followed.

An organized body of employers of that city

¹ See *Public Opinion and the Steel Strike*, Inter-Church World Movement.

sought to silence the voice of the Churches and to stifle public opinion by a campaign to withdraw or prevent further contributions to the Churches unless they withdrew their support. Similar organized action was taken by Employers' Associations against the Y.W.C.A. because they adopted a certain social programme, with the result that many subscribers withdrew their support. Abundant evidence has been furnished by those interested in the question in the United States of the existence of an organized campaign to use money-power to stifle the voice of the Church and of Christian organizations, on the industrial question. Undoubtedly thousands of employers have no sympathy with such efforts, but, apparently, they have not succeeded in stopping them. Such an attitude on the part of Employers' Organizations is as great a menace to industrial peace as Russian Bolshevism. It feeds Bolshevism. It may be that the Church leaders are not always wise in their policies or in their methods of advocating them; they may make mistakes like others, but that they are sincere, and that they are seeking to serve the highest interests of their country and of humanity, is beyond question, and if the voice of the Church, or of any other Christian organization, allowed itself to be silenced by money-power it would repudiate its Founder and cease to be Christian. Neither human welfare nor industrial peace can be secured by such means.

The problem cannot be solved by the war between Capital and Labour. War will not establish the rule of justice, and there can be no permanent removal of the unrest, nor any real industrial stability, until justice forms the basis of industrial relations—not simply what the employer considers justice, not simply what the working man considers justice, but what is really just and fair so far as it is humanly possible to secure just and fair relations. This can only be secured by co-operation. The ideal of co-operation expressed in the Peace Treaty is fundamentally right.

Human nature does not vary in capitalist and worker. The difference is in the different positions in which they find themselves under the present system. I believe that the employer would feel as the working man and the working man would feel as the employer if their positions were reversed. Surely a consciousness of this fact should beget a larger measure of sympathy one with the other. Is it not, however, fair to say to men of capital, because of the advantages and opportunities which they possess for investigation and for consideration of all aspects of the problem, that the primary responsibility rests upon them of facing this impasse as between Capital and Labour and of seeking to find a just and feasible solution ?

The
Church
and the
Problem.

What contribution can the Church make to the solution of the industrial problem ? Is it not

a challenge to the Church that so large a percentage of toilers has ceased to look to her either for spiritual leadership or moral support in their struggle to better their conditions? Does not this fact alone demand of the Church the most careful examination of the whole situation to ascertain the causes, and to endeavour to secure or regain the confidence of the men who toil? When the Man of Nazareth lived among men the common people heard Him gladly; so should it be with His Church.

One of the most hopeful signs for the future is the increasing evidence that the Church is awakening to the importance and gravity of the issue. This has been particularly noticeable since the war, and divided Christendom is now bearing a common testimony to the urgent need of a new spirit and a new attitude toward social and economic questions affecting the welfare of society. The Church must ever stand for social justice, and must protest against injustice and wrong just as faithfully and just as fearlessly as did Amos and Hosea in olden times. The Church must ever appeal for the highest standard of citizenship and throw all her influence against any forces or agencies which tend to degrade or destroy humanity or to deny to human beings the opportunity to make the best of the life God has given them. The Church should proclaim the obligation that every man and woman owes to society, to render intelligent and efficient service

for the common good ; that neither employers nor employees have a right to consider only their own immediate interests ; that each owes a duty to society which cannot be shirked or ignored without loss and prejudice to the community, and ultimately to the parties responsible for it, and that neither can play the rôle of Samson in the house of the Philistines without suffering Samson's fate.

It is not the function of the Church to solve the industrial problem ; the Church does not understand it well enough to do so, but the Church cannot ignore the problem and be true to her Founder. While the Church cannot solve the problem, the Church can—and should—create the atmosphere of brotherhood and the spirit of service, without which the problem cannot be solved. This is one of the supreme opportunities, and at the same time one of the great responsibilities, of the Church. The disciples of Karl Marx have by the propagation of his ideas revolutionized not only the economic conditions of Russia but the whole structure of Russian society. Should we expect less of the disciples of Christ than of those of Marx ? If they propagated the Christian ideas of human brotherhood and of unselfish service with equal success, they would revolutionize economic conditions, and with that the structure of modern society.

Principles of the solution. Are there not certain principles upon which all men of goodwill can agree ?

1. That the ultimate object of organized society should not be to produce wealth but should be to make possible the development of a wholesome, healthy, and intelligent citizenship. Labour, therefore, must not be regarded as a mere commodity or article of commerce.

2. That so long as the Wages System prevails a living wage should be the first charge upon industry, and if the choice must be made between sacrificing life or physical well-being on the one hand, or property on the other, life and physical well-being must not be sacrificed.

3. That the right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employer should be recognized.

4. That hours of labour should be so regulated as to ensure absolutely a weekly day of rest, which should include Sunday whenever practicable, and reasonable opportunity for rest and recreation during the other days of the week.

5. That both employer and employed should endeavour to do full justice to the other—one by way of payment for services rendered, the other by way of rendering full service for payment made.

6. That all practicable efforts should be put forth to prevent avoidable unemployment. Where unemployment is unavoidable, suitable provision should be made to avert the loss, suffering, and demoralization which are inseparable incidents of prolonged periods of unemployment.

7. That employers and employees should endeavour to work out a system of industrial relations under which Capital and Labour would share, both in determining the conditions under which their joint efforts should be carried on and in the results of those efforts.

8. That child labour should be abolished and adequate provision made for the education, both technical and otherwise, of children and young persons, and that such limitations should be placed on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

The great mass of mankind has already given its formal assent to the majority of these principles through the action of the Governments in approving the Treaties of Peace, and in several countries practical steps have been taken toward their realization. But more than formal assent is required to these principles and to the Labour Clauses in the Treaties of Peace. How can action be secured? Just as the League of Nations is a great experiment in international co-operation to promote justice and preserve peace among the nations, so the International Labour Organization is a great experiment in national and international co-operation to promote justice and peace in industrial relations. To ensure their success we must mobilize the public opinion of the world and

the moral sentiment of mankind. Should not the Church lead in this mobilization ?

There is another step we can and should take—a step in which the Church could give the lead—that is, to induce men of goodwill to recognize that the man on the other side, whether he be employer or employed, is a brother, that both are interested in establishing just and fair relations between Labour and Capital and that it is their duty to sit down together to study the question and to endeavour honestly to reach common ground upon which both can stand and cheerfully co-operate. That would be a great step toward establishing more harmonious relations in the industrial sphere and would pave the way to a better industrial order.

Is not Canada peculiarly well situated to make a real contribution toward the solution of the industrial problem ? We have neither the extremes of poverty or wealth which prevail in other countries, nor have we the class distinctions and animosities characteristic of older civilizations. We are neither dominated by Capital on the one hand nor by Labour on the other. There is a great body of public opinion in Canada outside the ranks of both Capital and Labour, strong enough, if it asserts itself, to see that justice is done to both and to require that each should do justice to the other. In addition, the leaders on both sides in

Canada
and the
Problem.

Canada have shown a real disposition in the Conferences already held to endeavour to reach a better general understanding on many aspects of the question, and, on the whole, Governments in Canada have shown a genuine interest in the problem, and an earnest desire to contribute toward its solution.

Our chief concern in Canada is not in the development of our natural resources ; not in the rapid settlement of our great unoccupied spaces ; not in the solution of our problems of transportation ; nor in all these combined—important and urgent as these all are. Our chief concern is in the type of citizenship we are developing. This will determine our future.

In this new country, in this New World, with such great possibilities before us, why should we be content to repeat the mistakes of the Old World ? Surely our task should be to profit by their experience, and to build a better social and industrial order. We have the opportunity ; shall we prove equal to it ?

CHAPTER XIV

THE CHURCH AND NATIONAL IDEALS

HUMANITY being one great living organism each part vitally connected with every other part, each nation's ideals directly or indirectly affect those of every other nation. The day has long since passed when any nation could live unto itself, and since the last war no one will question that a nation's ideals have a direct and immediate relation to World Peace. All history testifies that ideas are the most potent forces in the universe, and when an idea so takes possession of the mind of a people that it becomes a national ideal or a national passion it may determine the course of the nation's life.

The
Power of
Ideas.

Never since the early centuries of the Christian faith have there been more striking illustrations of the influence of ideas upon great masses of people than in our own day. I shall only mention a few : the Nationalist movement, which is stirring the whole Eastern World ; the Caliphate movement in the Moslem world ; the Bolshevik movement in Russia ; and lastly, and in some respects more striking than any of these, the great movement in Germany which preceded and led up to the war—the Prussianization and Militarization of the German people.

During the forty years which preceded the last war the leaders of Germany set themselves the task of establishing the military and industrial supremacy of Germany in the world. We know with what thoroughness and fidelity they pursued these ideals, and how nearly to all human appearances they attained them. When the war broke out Germany possessed the most powerful and efficient military machine ever commanded by man, and an industrial and commercial organization and a system of transportation adapted to her purposes unsurpassed by that of any other country.

When in August 1914 Germany plunged the world into war she expected a short and decisive campaign and a complete victory. If material forces and agencies could have ensured victory Germany's confidence was fully justified. Why did she fail in the end, and fail so disastrously? Germany failed because she left the moral factor out of account. We live in a moral universe in which spiritual and moral forces are more potent than material, and if there are any lessons we should learn from the war, they are that national success cannot be measured by material achievements or material standards; that false national ideals lead to disaster, and that there is a greater and nobler rôle for any nation than that of military or industrial supremacy; it is to share in the moral and spiritual leadership of mankind. If we

fail to learn these lessons from the war, much of the sacrifice has been in vain.

While statesmen and religious leaders proclaimed these apparently self-evident truths during the war, there does not appear to be any great eagerness on the part of the nations to practise them in peace. Already there are evidences on every hand that other nations are only too willing to pursue Germany's material ideals and to repeat Germany's mistakes. Can any one doubt that the pursuit will lead to similar disaster ? The spirit of domination breeds suspicion, ill will, and strife. The spirit of service breeds confidence, goodwill, and peace. Why should not the nations emulate each other in aspiring to intellectual, moral, or spiritual leadership ? They should aim to serve rather than to dominate humanity. This is the road to true national success, to true national greatness.

If the ideals of justice, brotherhood, and service are to triumph in the life of a nation they must become the ideals of the children and youth of the land. The German Government changed the ideals and character of the German people in less than two generations by the control of the education of the children and youth of Germany. While we may disapprove of both the ideals and the methods adopted by Germany to realize them, we cannot question that she has shown the world what can be accomplished in the course of even one or two generations through the systematic and

thorough education of the youth of the land. Her achievement is a fact of great significance to the world. What is the national ideal which is being taught in the schools of this and other lands to-day; is it the ideal of domination or of service? The answer to this question has a direct and vital bearing on the future peace of the world. The peace and progress of the world during the next generation depends upon the education of the youth of to-day. Are we paying sufficient attention to the teaching of the Christian ethic in our schools? Religious differences should not prevent instruction in those moral and ethical principles which should lie at the very foundation of both individual and national character.

The political order of society has undergone revolutionary changes during and since the war. Some of these have been mentioned in the former lectures. The monarchical principle of authority has given place, among millions of men, to the democratic, and in other and so-called democratic countries millions who before the war had no voice in the government of their country have been given the franchise, and this steady movement toward democracy is still going on. To-day the democratic ideal dominates the world.

The
Test of
Demo-
cracy.

We are so close to these great movements that it is difficult for us to appreciate either their magnitude or their importance to the peace of the world; but of this we may be assured, that the war

has given to democracy a new meaning, and peace a new opportunity. Democracy, as a form of government, faces the greatest task and the most severe test in history. How will democracy exercise its powers? The peace and progress of the world depends on the answer to this question. We must realize that an ignorant, a prejudiced, or a corrupt democracy may be as great a menace to peace as a military autocracy. It may be swayed by prejudice, stirred by passion, or misled by incompetent or corrupt rulers. The success of democracy depends upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the public spirit of its citizens. One of the real perils of democracy in even the most progressive nations is that in times of peace so many men of education, of business capacity, and of experience, ignore their political duties and leave the whole responsibility for participation in the work of government to those with less knowledge and less experience. It is the failure of so large a percentage of the so-called best citizens to discharge their political duties which gives such great opportunities to the demagogue and corrupt politician, and which may place the real power of government in the hands of a political machine which will use it to further its own ends. Democracies require the same unselfish service to the State on the part of all their citizens, in times of peace as in times of war, and the failure to render such services should be counted not less unpatriotic

in peace than in war. The Church should unceasingly proclaim the imperative duty of every citizen to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

The high idealism and the spirit of unselfish devotion which so characterized the closing years of the war are not conspicuously in evidence to-day. We are passing through a period of disillusionment and discouragement. The shock of the world-upheaval has shaken the faith of multitudes, their faith in humanity and in human progress, their faith in religion and in the reality and power of the Unseen, their faith in the honesty, sincerity, and capacity of Governments, their faith in the conventions and traditions which have governed individual and national conduct in the past. The period is one of great unsettlement. Men have loosed themselves from the old moorings and have not found new ones. The world needs a great accession of faith, a new and more intelligent faith, faith in humanity and in human progress, faith in religion and in the reality and power of the Unseen, faith in the triumph of right over wrong, of justice over injustice, of love over hate.

While we are gradually getting away from the hate and bitterness of the war, we also need a great increase in charity to heal the wounds of the world and to restore the spirit of brotherhood and peace.

What existing agency has a greater opportunity than the Church, to set before the people the value and transcendent importance of true national ideals: to proclaim the imperative duties of citizenship, to inspire new faith and courage in our humanity, and to manifest an all-embracing and unconquerable love ?

CHAPTER XV

THE CHANGING RELIGIOUS ORDER

CERTAIN aspects of truth which our fathers considered of primary importance appear to have lost much of their significance in the light of present-day conditions, and new and larger aspects of truth have come to the front and demand recognition at the hands of the Church. In view of the gigantic tasks facing the Church, and of the great gulf that exists between the ideals which she proclaims and the actual conditions of human society, the urgent demand is for unity and co-operation in the proclamation of those ideals and the performance of these great tasks. How can the Church as a whole measure up to the tasks before her if her several branches are spending a large part of their energies in competing with one another in order to maintain a more or less precarious existence in many communities in this and other lands? Is there anything that is really more disheartening, in view of the issues we are facing and the unfinished tasks at our doors, than to see one branch of the Christian Church frittering away her energies in competition with some other in small communities? One sees many signs that the Church is recognizing the conditions and is preparing to meet them. There is a real movement

toward Christian unity. Already the Churches in the mission field have made a very great contribution to Christian co-operation and unity—they are blazing the trail. The Churches at home should speedily follow their example. In this great movement toward Christian unity to meet the world's need the Churches of Canada should play an honourable part.

Amid the distracting and conflicting voices which are heard on every hand, humanity longs to hear the clear, strong note of moral leadership, the call to duty and service, not only of individuals and of communities, but of nations ; the call that in national and international relations the principles of right and justice shall prevail. Humanity looks to the Church to strike this clear, strong, compelling note. Will the Church strike it ? Is the faith of the Church equal to the task ? In every Church the prayer of our Lord is repeated. 'Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven.' Does the Church believe in the practicability of the programme of her Lord and Master ? Does she believe in the prayer daily uttered by her members ? If so, with that unquenchable faith, that undaunted courage, and that heroic self-sacrifice which inspired the pioneers of the Christian faith, she may move forward until the great goal is reached and 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ'.

APPENDIX A

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT

FOR A

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

1. IRELAND shall have the same constitutional status in the Community of Nations known as the British Empire as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, with a Parliament having powers to make laws for the peace order and good government of Ireland and an Executive responsible to that Parliament, and shall be styled and known as the Irish Free State.

2. Subject to the provisions hereinafter set out the position of the Irish Free State in relation to the Imperial Parliament and Government and otherwise shall be that of the Dominion of Canada, and the law, practice and constitutional usage governing the relationship of the Crown or the representative of the Crown and of the Imperial Parliament to the Dominion of Canada shall govern their relationship to the Irish Free State.

3. The representative of the Crown in Ireland shall be appointed in like manner as the Governor-General of Canada, and in accordance with the practice observed in the making of such appointments.

4. The oath to be taken by Members of the

Parliament of the Irish Free State shall be in the following form :

I do solemnly swear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the Irish Free State as by law established and that I will be faithful to H.M. King George V., his heirs and successors by law, in virtue of the common citizenship of Ireland with Great Britain and her adherence to and membership of the group of nations forming the British Commonwealth of Nations.

5. The Irish Free State shall assume liability for the service of the Public Debt of the United Kingdom as existing at the date hereof and towards the payment of war pensions as existing at that date in such proportion as may be fair and equitable, having regard to any just claims on the part of Ireland by way of set off or counterclaim, the amount of such sums being determined in default of agreement by the arbitration of one or more independent persons being citizens of the British Empire.

6. Until an arrangement has been made between the British and Irish Governments whereby the Irish Free State undertakes her own coastal defence, the defence by sea of Great Britain and Ireland shall be undertaken by His Majesty's Imperial Forces, but this shall not prevent the construction or maintenance by the Government of the Irish Free State of such vessels as are necessary for the protection of the Revenue or the Fisheries.

The foregoing provisions of this article shall be

reviewed at a conference of Representatives of the British and Irish Governments to be held at the expiration of five years from the date hereof with a view to the undertaking by Ireland of a share in her own coastal defence.

7. The Government of the Irish Free State shall afford to His Majesty's Imperial Forces :

(a) In time of peace such harbour and other facilities as are indicated in the Annex hereto, or such other facilities as may from time to time be agreed between the British Government and the Government of the Irish Free State ; and

(b) In time of war or of strained relations with a Foreign Power such harbour and other facilities as the British Government may require for the purposes of such defence as aforesaid.

8. With a view to securing the observance of the principle of international limitation of armaments, if the Government of the Irish Free State establishes and maintains a military defence force, the establishments thereof shall not exceed in size such proportion of the military establishments maintained in Great Britain as that which the population of Ireland bears to the population of Great Britain.

9. The ports of Great Britain and the Irish Free State shall be freely open to the ships of the other country on payment of the customary port and other dues.

10. The Government of the Irish Free State agrees to pay fair compensation on terms not less favourable than those accorded by the Act of 1920 to judges, officials, members of Police Forces, and

other Public Servants, who are discharged by it or who retire in consequence of the change of government effected in pursuance hereof.

Provided that this agreement shall not apply to members of the Auxiliary Police Force or to persons recruited in Great Britain for the Royal Irish Constabulary during the two years next preceding the date hereof. The British Government will assume responsibility for such compensation or pensions as may be payable to any of these excepted persons.

11. Until the expiration of one month from the passing of the Act of Parliament for the ratification of this instrument, the powers of the Parliament and the Government of the Irish Free State shall not be exercisable as respects Northern Ireland, and the provisions of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, shall, so far as they relate to Northern Ireland, remain of full force and effect, and no election shall be held for the return of members to serve in the Parliament of the Irish Free State for constituencies in Northern Ireland, unless a resolution is passed by both Houses of the Parliament of Northern Ireland in favour of the holding of such elections before the end of the said month.

12. If, before the expiration of the said month, an address is presented to His Majesty by both Houses of the Parliament of Northern Ireland to that effect, the powers of the Parliament and the Government of the Irish Free State shall no longer extend to Northern Ireland, and the provisions of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920 (including those relating to the Council of Ireland), shall, so

far as they relate to Northern Ireland, continue to be of full force and effect, and this instrument shall have effect subject to the necessary modifications.

Provided that if such an address is so presented a Commission consisting of three persons, one to be appointed by the Government of the Irish Free State, one to be appointed by the Government of Northern Ireland, and one who shall be Chairman, to be appointed by the British Government, shall determine, in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants, so far as may be compatible with economic and geographic conditions, the boundaries between Northern Ireland and the rest of Ireland, and for the purposes of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, and of this instrument, the boundary of Northern Ireland shall be such as may be determined by such Commission.

13. For the purpose of the last foregoing article, the powers of the Parliament of Southern Ireland under the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, to elect members of the Council of Ireland, shall, after the Parliament of the Irish Free State is constituted, be exercised by that Parliament.

14. After the expiration of the said month, if no such address as is mentioned in Article 12 hereof is presented, the Parliament and Government of Northern Ireland shall continue to exercise as respects Northern Ireland the powers conferred on them by the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, but the Parliament and Government of the Irish Free State shall in Northern Ireland have in relation to matters in respect of which the Parliament of Northern Ireland has not power to make

laws under that Act (including matters which under the said Act are within the jurisdiction of the Council of Ireland) the same powers as in the rest of Ireland subject to such other provisions as may be agreed in manner hereinafter appearing.

15. At any time after the date hereof the Government of Northern Ireland and the provisional Government of Southern Ireland hereinafter constituted may meet for the purpose of discussing the provisions subject to which the last foregoing Article is to operate in the event of no such address as is therein mentioned being presented, and those provisions may include :

(a) safeguards with regard to patronage in Northern Ireland,

(b) safeguards with regard to the collection of revenue in Northern Ireland,

(c) safeguards with regard to import and export duties affecting the trade or industry of Northern Ireland,

(d) safeguards for minorities in Northern Ireland,

(e) the settlement of the financial relations between Northern Ireland and the Irish Free State,

(f) the establishment and powers of a local militia in Northern Ireland and the relation of the Defence Forces of the Irish Free State and of Northern Ireland respectively ;

and if at any such meeting provisions are agreed to, the same shall have effect as if they were included amongst the provisions subject to which the powers of the Parliament and Government of

the Irish Free State are to be exercisable in Northern Ireland under Article 14 hereof.

16. Neither the Parliament of the Irish Free State nor the Parliament of Northern Ireland shall make any law so as either directly or indirectly to endow any religion or prohibit or restrict the free exercise thereof or give any preference or impose any disability on account of religious belief or religious status or affect prejudicially the right of any child to attend a school receiving public money without attending the religious instruction at the school or make any discrimination as respects State aid between schools under the management of different religious denominations or divert from any religious denomination or any educational institution any of its property except for public utility purposes and on payment of compensation.

17. By way of provisional arrangement for the administration of Southern Ireland during the interval which must elapse between the date hereof and the constitution of a Parliament and Government of the Irish Free State in accordance therewith, steps shall be taken forthwith for summoning a meeting of members of Parliament elected for constituencies in Southern Ireland since the passing of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, and for constituting a provisional Government, and the British Government shall take the steps necessary to transfer to such provisional Government the powers and machinery requisite for the discharge of its duties, provided that every member of such provisional Government shall have signified

in writing his or her acceptance of this instrument. But this arrangement shall not continue in force beyond the expiration of twelve months from the date hereof.

18. This instrument shall be submitted forthwith by His Majesty's Government for the approval of Parliament and by the Irish signatories to a meeting summoned for the purpose of the members elected to sit in the House of Commons of Southern Ireland, and, if approved, shall be ratified by the necessary legislation.

(Signed)

On behalf of the British
Delegation.

D. LLOYD GEORGE.

AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN.

BIRKENHEAD.

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS.

HAMAR GREENWOOD.

GORDON HEWART.

On behalf of the Irish
Delegation.

ART Ó GRIOBHTHA.

MICHAÉL Ó COILEAIN,

RIOBÁRD BARTÚN.

E. S. Ó DUGAIN.

SEÓRSA GHABÁHIN ÚI

DHUBHTHAIGH.

6th December, 1921.

ANNEX

1. The following are the specific facilities required.

DOCKYARD PORT AT BEREHAVEN

(a) Admiralty property and rights to be retained as at the date hereof. Harbour defences to remain in charge of British care and maintenance parties.

QUEENSTOWN

(b) Harbour defences to remain in charge of British care and maintenance parties. Certain mooring buoys to be retained for use of His Majesty's ships.

BELFAST LOUGH

(c) Harbour defences to remain in charge of British care and maintenance parties.

LOUGH SWILLY

(d) Harbour defences to remain in charge of British care and maintenance parties.

AVIATION

(e) Facilities in the neighbourhood of the above ports for coastal defence by air.

OIL FUEL STORAGE

(f) Haulbowline	. {	To be offered for sale to commercial companies under guarantee that purchasers shall maintain a certain minimum stock for Admiralty purposes.
Rathmullen		

2. A Convention shall be made between the British Government and the Government of the Irish Free State to give effect to the following conditions :

(a) That submarine cables shall not be landed or wireless stations for communication with places outside Ireland be established except by agreement with the British Government ; that the existing cable landing rights and wireless concessions shall not be withdrawn except by agreement with the British Government ; and that the British Government shall be entitled to land additional submarine cables or establish additional wireless stations for communication with places outside Ireland.

(b) That lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and any navigational marks or navigational aids shall be maintained by the Government of the Irish Free State as at the date hereof and shall not be removed or added to except by agreement with the British Government.

(c) That war signal stations shall be closed down and left in charge of care and maintenance parties, the Government of the Irish Free State being offered the option of taking them over and working them for commercial purposes subject to Admiralty inspection and guaranteeing the upkeep of existing telegraphic communication therewith.

3. A Convention shall be made between the same Governments for the regulation of Civil Communication by Air.

APPENDIX B

A TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE BRITISH EMPIRE, FRANCE, ITALY, AND JAPAN, LIMITING NAVAL ARMAMENT

THE United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan ;

Desiring to contribute to the maintenance of the general peace, and to reduce the burdens of competition in armament ;

Have resolved, with a view to accomplishing these purposes, to conclude a treaty to limit their respective naval armament, and to that end have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries ;

The President of the United States of America :
Charles Evans Hughes,
Henry Cabot Lodge,
Oscar W. Underwood,
Elihu Root,

Citizens of the United States ;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India :

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P., Lord President of His Privy Council ;

The Right Honourable Baron Lee of Fareham, G.B.E., K.C.B., First Lord of His Admiralty ;

The Right Honourable Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, K.C.B., His Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to
the United States of America ;

and

for the Dominion of Canada :

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird
Borden, G.C.M.G., K.C. ;

for the Commonwealth of Australia :

Senator the Right Honourable George
Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and
Territories ;

for the Dominion of New Zealand :

The Honourable Sir John William Salmond,
K.C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New
Zealand ;

for the Union of South Africa :

The Right Honourable Arthur James
Balfour, O.M., M.P. ;

for India :

The Right Honourable Valingman San-
karanarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member
of the Indian Council of State ;

The President of the French Republic :

Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the
Colonies ;

Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extra-
ordinary and Plenipotentiary to the
United States of America, Grand Cross of
the National Order of the Legion of
Honour ;

His Majesty the King of Italy :

The Honourable Carlo Schanzer, Senator of
the Kingdom ;

The Honourable Vittorio Rolandi Ricci,
Senator of the Kingdom, His Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at
Washington ;

The Honourable Luigi Albertini, Senator of
the Kingdom ;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan :

Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the
Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class
of the Imperial Order of the Grand
Cordon of the Rising Sun with the
Paulownia Flower ;

Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at
Washington, Joshii, a member of the
First Class of the Imperial Order of the
Rising Sun ;

Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice Minister for
Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the
Second Class of the Imperial Order of the
Rising Sun ;

Who, having communicated to each other their
respective full powers, found to be in good and due
form, have agreed as follows :

CHAPTER I

GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT

ARTICLE I.

The Contracting Powers agree to limit their
respective naval armament as provided in the
present Treaty.

ARTICLE II.

The Contracting Powers may retain respectively the capital ships which are specified in Chapter II, Part 1. On the coming into force of the present Treaty, but subject to the following provisions of this Article, all other capital ships, built or building, of the United States, the British Empire and Japan shall be disposed of as prescribed in Chapter II, Part 2.

In addition to the capital ships specified in Chapter II, Part 1, the United States may complete and retain two ships of the *West Virginia* class now under construction. On the completion of these two ships the *North Dakota* and *Delaware* shall be disposed of as prescribed in Chapter II, Part 2.

The British Empire may, in accordance with the replacement table in Chapter II, Part 3, construct two new capital ships not exceeding 35,000 tons (35,560 metric tons) standard displacement each. On the completion of the said two ships the *Thunderer*, *King George V*, *Ajax* and *Centurion* shall be disposed of as prescribed in Chapter II, Part 2.

ARTICLE III.

Subject to the provisions of Article II, the Contracting Powers shall abandon their respective capital ship building programmes, and no new capital ships shall be constructed or acquired by any of the Contracting Powers except replacement tonnage which may be constructed or acquired as specified in Chapter II, Part 3.

Ships which are replaced in accordance with

Chapter II, Part 3, shall be disposed of as prescribed in Part 2 of that Chapter.

ARTICLE IV.

The total capital ship replacement tonnage of each of the Contracting Powers shall not exceed in standard displacement, for the United States 525,000 tons (533,400 metric tons); for the British Empire 525,000 tons (533,400 metric tons); for France 175,000 tons (177,800 metric tons); for Italy 175,000 tons (177,800 metric tons); for Japan 315,000 tons (320,040 metric tons).

ARTICLE V.

No capital ship exceeding 35,000 tons (35,560 metric tons) standard displacement shall be acquired by, or constructed by, for, or within the jurisdiction of, any of the Contracting Powers.

ARTICLE VI.

No capital ship of any of the Contracting Powers shall carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 16 inches (406 millimetres).

ARTICLE VII.

The total tonnage for aircraft carriers of each of the Contracting Powers shall not exceed in standard displacement, for the United States 135,000 tons (137,160 metric tons); for the British Empire 135,000 tons (137,160 metric tons); for France 60,000 tons (60,960 metric tons); for Italy 60,000 tons (60,960 metric tons); for Japan 81,000 tons (82,296 metric tons).

ARTICLE VIII.

The replacement of aircraft carriers shall be effected only as prescribed in Chapter II, Part 3, provided, however, that all aircraft carrier tonnage in existence or building on November 12, 1921, shall be considered experimental, and may be replaced, within the total tonnage limit prescribed in Article VII, without regard to its age.

ARTICLE IX.

No aircraft carrier exceeding 27,000 tons (27,432 metric tons) standard displacement shall be acquired by, or constructed by, for, or within the jurisdiction of, any of the Contracting Powers.

However, any of the Contracting Powers may, provided that its total tonnage allowance of aircraft carriers is not thereby exceeded, build not more than two aircraft carriers, each of a tonnage of not more than 33,000 tons (33,528 metric tons) standard displacement, and in order to effect economy any of the Contracting Powers may use for this purpose any two of their ships, whether constructed or in course of construction, which would otherwise be scrapped under the provisions of Article II. The armament of any aircraft carriers exceeding 27,000 tons (27,432 metric tons) standard displacement shall be in accordance with the requirements of Article X, except that the total number of guns to be carried in case any of such guns be of a calibre exceeding 6 inches (152 millimetres), except anti-aircraft guns and guns not exceeding 5 inches (127 millimetres), shall not exceed eight.

ARTICLE X.

No aircraft carrier of any of the Contracting Powers shall carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 8 inches (203 millimetres). Without prejudice to the provisions of Article IX, if the armament carried includes guns exceeding 6 inches (152 millimetres) in calibre the total number of guns carried, except anti-aircraft guns and guns not exceeding 5 inches (127 millimetres), shall not exceed ten. If alternatively the armament contains no guns exceeding 6 inches (152 millimetres) in calibre, the number of guns is not limited. In either case the number of anti-aircraft guns and of guns not exceeding 5 inches (127 millimetres) is not limited.

ARTICLE XI.

No vessel of war exceeding 10,000 tons (10,160 metric tons) standard displacement, other than a capital ship or aircraft carrier, shall be acquired by, or constructed by, for, or within the jurisdiction of, any of the Contracting Powers. Vessels not specifically built as fighting ships nor taken in time of peace under government control for fighting purposes, which are employed on fleet duties or as troop transports or in some other way for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of hostilities otherwise than as fighting ships, shall not be within the limitations of this Article.

ARTICLE XII.

No vessel of war of any of the Contracting Powers, hereafter laid down, other than a capital ship, shall carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 8 inches (203 millimetres).

ARTICLE XIII.

Except as provided in Article IX, no ship designated in the present Treaty to be scrapped may be reconverted into a vessel of war.

ARTICLE XIV.

No preparations shall be made in merchant ships in time of peace for the installation of warlike armaments for the purpose of converting such ships into vessels of war, other than the necessary stiffening of decks for the mounting of guns not exceeding 6 inch (152 millimetres) calibre.

ARTICLE XV.

No vessel of war constructed within the jurisdiction of any of the Contracting Powers for a non-Contracting Power shall exceed the limitations as to displacement and armament prescribed by the present Treaty for vessels of a similar type which may be constructed by or for any of the Contracting Powers; provided, however, that the displacement for aircraft carriers constructed for a non-Contracting Power shall in no case exceed 27,000 tons (27,432 metric tons) standard displacement.

ARTICLE XVI.

If the construction of any vessel of war for a non-Contracting Power is undertaken within the jurisdiction of any of the Contracting Powers, such Power shall promptly inform the other Contracting Powers of the date of the signing of the contract and the date on which the keel of the ship is laid ;

and shall also communicate to them the particulars relating to the ship prescribed in Chapter II, Part 3, Section 1 (b), (4) and (5).

ARTICLE XVII.

In the event of a Contracting Power being engaged in war, such Power shall not use as a vessel of war any vessel of war which may be under construction within its jurisdiction for any other Power, or which may have been constructed within its jurisdiction for another Power and not delivered.

ARTICLE XVIII.

Each of the Contracting Powers undertakes not to dispose by gift, sale or any mode of transfer of any vessel of war in such a manner that such vessel may become a vessel of war in the Navy of any foreign Power.

ARTICLE XIX.

The United States, the British Empire and Japan agree that the status quo at the time of the signing of the present Treaty, with regard to fortifications and naval bases, shall be maintained in their respective territories and possessions specified hereunder :

(1) The insular possessions which the United States now holds or may hereafter acquire in the Pacific Ocean, except (a) those adjacent to the coast of the United States, Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone, not including the Aleutian Islands, and (b) the Hawaiian Islands ;

(2) Hongkong and the insular possessions which the British Empire now holds or may hereafter acquire in the Pacific Ocean, east of the meridian of 110° east longitude, except (a) those adjacent to the coast of Canada, (b) the Commonwealth of Australia and its Territories, and (c) New Zealand ;

(3) The following insular territories and possessions of Japan in the Pacific Ocean, to wit : the Kurile Islands, the Bonin Islands, Amami-Oshima, the Loochoo Islands, Formosa and the Pescadores, and any insular territories or possessions in the Pacific Ocean which Japan may hereafter acquire.

The maintenance of the status quo under the foregoing provisions implies that no new fortifications or naval bases shall be established in the territories and possessions specified ; that no measures shall be taken to increase the existing naval facilities for the repair and maintenance of naval forces, and that no increase shall be made in the coast defences of the territories and possessions above specified. This restriction, however, does not preclude such repair and replacement of worn-out weapons and equipment as is customary in naval and military establishments in time of peace.

ARTICLE XX.

The rules for determining tonnage displacement prescribed in Chapter II, Part 4, shall apply to the ships of each of the Contracting Powers.

CHAPTER II

RULES RELATING TO THE EXECUTION OF THE
TREATY—DEFINITION OF TERMS

PART I.

CAPITAL SHIPS WHICH MAY BE RETAINED
BY THE CONTRACTING POWERS.

In accordance with Article II ships may be retained by each of the Contracting Powers as specified in this Part.

Ships which may be retained by the United States.

Name :	Tonnage
Maryland	32,600
California	32,300
Tennessee	32,300
Idaho	32,000
New Mexico	32,000
Mississippi	32,000
Arizona	31,400
Pennsylvania	31,400
Oklahoma	27,500
Nevada	27,500
New York	27,000
Texas	27,000
Arkansas	26,000
Wyoming	26,000
Florida	21,825
Utah	21,825
North Dakota	20,000
Delaware	20,000
Total tonnage	500,650

On the completion of the two ships of the *West Virginia* class and the scrapping of the *North Dakota* and *Delaware*, as provided in Article II, the total tonnage to be retained by the United States will be 525,850 tons.

Ships which may be retained by the British Empire.

Name :	Tonnage
Royal Sovereign	25,750
Royal Oak	25,750
Revenge	25,750
Resolution	25,750
Ramillies	25,750
Malaya	27,500
Valiant	27,500
Barham	27,500
Queen Elizabeth	27,500
Warspite	27,500
Benbow	25,000
Emperor of India	25,000
Iron Duke	25,000
Marlborough	25,000
Hood	41,200
Renown	26,500
Repulse	26,500
Tiger	28,500
Thunderer	22,500
King George V	23,000
Ajax	23,000
Centurion	23,000
Total tonnage	580,450

On the completion of the two new ships to be constructed and the scrapping of the *Thunderer*, *King George V*, *Ajax* and *Centurion*, as provided in Article II, the total tonnage to be retained by the British Empire will be 558,950 tons.

Ships which may be retained by France.

Name :	Tonnage. (metric tons)
Bretagne	23,500
Lorraine	23,500
Provence	23,500
Paris	23,500
France	23,500
Jean Bart	23,500
Courbet	23,500
Condorcet	18,890
Diderot	18,890
Voltaire	18,890
Total tonnage	221,170

France may lay down new tonnage in the years 1927, 1929, and 1931, as provided in Part 3, Section II.

Ships which may be retained by Italy.

Name :	Tonnage) (metric tons)
Andrea Doria	22,700
Caio Duilio	22,700
Conti Di Cavour	22,500
Giulio Cesare	22,500
Leonardo Da Vinci	22,500
Dante Alighieri	19,500
Roma	12,600
Napoli	12,600
Vittorio Emanuele	12,600
Regina Elena	12,600
Total tonnage	182,800

Italy may lay down new tonnage in the years 1927, 1929, and 1931, as provided in Part 3, Section II.

Ships which may be retained by Japan.

Name :	Tonnage
Mutsu	33,800
Nagato	33,800
Hiuga	31,260
Ise	31,260
Yamashiro	30,600
Fu-So	30,600
Kirishima	27,500
Haruna	27,500
Hiyei	27,500
Kongo	27,500
Total tonnage	301,320

PART 2.

RULES FOR SCRAPPING VESSELS OF WAR.

The following rules shall be observed for the scrapping of vessels of war which are to be disposed of in accordance with Articles II and III.

- I. A vessel to be scrapped must be placed in such condition that it cannot be put to combatant use.
- II. This result must be finally effected in any one of the following ways :
 - (a) Permanent sinking of the vessel ;
 - (b) Breaking the vessel up. This shall always involve the destruction or removal of all machinery, boilers and armour, and all deck, side and bottom plating ;
 - (c) Converting the vessel to target use exclusively. In such case all the provisions of paragraph III of this Part, except subparagraph (6), in so far as may be necessary to enable the ship to be used as a mobile target, and except subparagraph (7), must be previously complied with. Not more than one capital ship may be retained for this purpose at one time by any of the Contracting Powers.
 - (d) Of the capital ships which would otherwise be scrapped under the present Treaty in or after the year 1931, France and Italy may each retain two sea-going vessels for training purposes exclusively, that is, as gunnery or torpedo schools.

The two vessels retained by France shall be of the *Jean Bart* class, and of those retained by Italy one shall be the *Dante Alighieri*, the other of the *Giulio Cesare* class. On retaining these ships for the purpose above stated, France and Italy respectively undertake to remove and destroy their conning-towers, and not to use the said ships as vessels of war.

III. (a) Subject to the special exceptions contained in Article IX, when a vessel is due for scrapping, the first stage of scrapping, which consists in rendering a ship incapable of further warlike service, shall be immediately undertaken.

(b) A vessel shall be considered incapable of further warlike service when there shall have been removed and landed, or else destroyed in the ship :

- (1) All guns and essential portions of guns, fire-control tops and revolving parts of all barbettes and turrets ;
- (2) All machinery for working hydraulic or electric mountings ;
- (3) All fire-control instruments and range-finders ;
- (4) All ammunition, explosives and mines ;
- (5) All torpedoes, war-heads and torpedo tubes ;
- (6) All wireless telegraphy installations ;
- (7) The conning tower and all side

armour, or alternatively all main propelling machinery ; and

- (8) All landing and flying-off platforms and all other aviation accessories.

IV. The periods in which scrapping of vessels is to be effected are as follows :

- (a) In the case of vessels to be scrapped under the first paragraph of Article II, the work of rendering the vessels incapable of further warlike service, in accordance with paragraph III of this Part, shall be completed within six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, and the scrapping shall be finally effected within eighteen months from such coming into force.
- (b) In the case of vessels to be scrapped under the second and third paragraphs of Article II, or under Article III, the work of rendering the vessel incapable of further warlike service in accordance with paragraph III of this Part shall be commenced not later than the date of completion of its successor, and shall be finished within six months from the date of such completion. The vessel shall be finally scrapped, in accordance with paragraph II of this Part, within eighteen months from the date of completion of its successor. If, however, the completion of the new vessel be delayed, then the work of rendering the old vessel incapable

of further warlike service in accordance with paragraph III of this Part shall be commenced within four years from the laying of the keel of the new vessel, and shall be finished within six months from the date on which such work was commenced, and the old vessel shall be finally scrapped in accordance with paragraph II of this Part within eighteen months from the date when the work of rendering it incapable of further warlike service was commenced.

PART 3.

REPLACEMENT.

The replacement of capital ships and aircraft carriers shall take place according to the rules in Section I and the tables in Section II of this Part.

SECTION I.

RULES FOR REPLACEMENT.

(a) Capital ships and aircraft carriers twenty years after the date of their completion may, except as otherwise provided in Article VIII and in the tables in Section II of this Part, be replaced by new construction, but within the limits prescribed in Article IV and Article VII. The keels of such new construction may, except as otherwise provided in Article VIII and in the tables in Section II of this Part, be laid down not earlier than seventeen years from the date of completion

of the tonnage to be replaced, provided, however, that no capital ship tonnage, with the exception of the ships referred to in the third paragraph of Article II, and the replacement tonnage specifically mentioned in Section II of this Part, shall be laid down until ten years from November 12, 1921.

(b) Each of the Contracting Powers shall communicate promptly to each of the other Contracting Powers the following information :

- (1) The names of the capital ships and aircraft carriers to be replaced by new construction ;
- (2) The date of governmental authorization of replacement tonnage ;
- (3) The date of laying the keels of replacement tonnage.
- (4) The standard displacement in tons and metric tons of each new ship to be laid down, and the principal dimensions, namely, length at waterline, extreme beam at or below waterline, mean draft at standard displacement ;
- (5) The date of completion of each new ship and its standard displacement in tons and metric tons, and the principal dimensions, namely, length at waterline, extreme beam at or below waterline, mean draft as standard displacement, at time of completion.

(c) In case of loss or accidental destruction of capital ships or aircraft carriers, they may immediately be replaced by new construction subject

to the tonnage limits prescribed in Articles IV and VII and in conformity with the other provisions of the present Treaty, the regular replacement program being deemed to be advanced to that extent.

(d) No retained capital ships or aircraft carriers shall be reconstructed except for the purpose of providing means of defense against air and submarine attack, and subject to the following rules : The Contracting Powers may, for that purpose, equip existing tonnage with bulge or blister or anti-air attack deck protection, providing the increase of displacement thus effected does not exceed 3,000 tons (3,048 metric tons) displacement for each ship. No alterations in side armour, in calibre, number or general type of mounting of main armament shall be permitted except :

- (1) in the case of France and Italy, which countries within the limits allowed for bulge may increase their armour protection and the calibre of the guns now carried on their existing capital ships so as not to exceed 16 inches (406 millimetres) and
- (2) the British Empire shall be permitted to complete, in the case of the *Renown*, the alterations to armour that have already been commenced but temporarily suspended.

(NOTE.—The tables governing replacement and scrapping of capital ships have been omitted.)

PART 4.

DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of the present Treaty, the following expressions are to be understood in the sense defined in this Part.

CAPITAL SHIP.

A capital ship, in the case of ships hereafter built, is defined as a vessel of war, not an aircraft carrier, whose displacement exceeds 10,000 tons (10,160 metric tons) standard displacement, or which carries a gun with a calibre exceeding 8 inches (203 millimetres).

AIRCRAFT CARRIER.

An aircraft carrier is defined as a vessel of war with a displacement in excess of 10,000 tons (10,160 metric tons) standard displacement designed for the specific and exclusive purpose of carrying aircraft. It must be so constructed that aircraft can be launched therefrom and landed thereon, and not designed and constructed for carrying a more powerful armament than that allowed to it under Article IX or Article X as the case may be.

STANDARD DISPLACEMENT.

The standard displacement of a ship is the displacement of the ship complete, fully manned, engined, and equipped ready for sea, including all armament and ammunition, equipment, outfit, provisions and fresh water for crew, miscellaneous stores and implements of every description that

are intended to be carried in war, but without fuel or reserve feed water on board.

The word 'ton' in the present Treaty, except in the expression 'metric tons', shall be understood to mean the ton of 2,240 pounds (1,016 kilos).

Vessels now completed shall retain their present ratings of displacement tonnage in accordance with their national system of measurement. However, a Power expressing displacement in metric tons shall be considered for the application of the present Treaty as owning only the equivalent displacement in tons of 2,240 pounds.

A vessel completed hereafter shall be rated at its displacement tonnage when in the standard condition defined herein.

CHAPTER III

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ARTICLE XXI.

If during the term of the present Treaty the requirements of the national security of any Contracting Power in respect of naval defence are, in the opinion of that Power, materially affected by any change of circumstances, the Contracting Powers will, at the request of such Power, meet in conference with a view to the reconsideration of the provisions of the Treaty and its amendment by mutual agreement.

In view of possible technical and scientific developments, the United States, after consultation with the other Contracting Powers, shall arrange for a conference of all the Contracting Powers which shall convene as soon as possible

after the expiration of eight years from the coming into force of the present Treaty to consider what changes, if any, in the Treaty may be necessary to meet such developments.

ARTICLE XXII.

Whenever any Contracting Power shall become engaged in a war which in its opinion affects the naval defence of its national security, such Power may after notice to the other Contracting Powers suspend for the period of hostilities its obligations under the present Treaty other than those under Articles XIII and XVII, provided that such Power shall notify the other Contracting Powers that the emergency is of such a character as to require such suspension.

The remaining Contracting Powers shall in such case consult together with a view to agreement as to what temporary modifications if any should be made in the Treaty as between themselves. Should such consultation not produce agreement, duly made in accordance with the constitutional methods of the respective Powers, any one of said Contracting Powers may, by giving notice to the other Contracting Powers, suspend for the period of hostilities its obligations under the present Treaty, other than those under Articles XIII and XVII.

On the cessation of hostilities the Contracting Powers will meet in conference to consider what modifications, if any, should be made in the provisions of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE XXIII.

The present Treaty shall remain in force until December 31st, 1936, and in case none of the

Contracting Powers shall have given notice two years before that date of its intention to terminate the Treaty, it shall continue in force until the expiration of two years from the date on which notice of termination shall be given by one of the Contracting Powers, whereupon the Treaty shall terminate as regards all the Contracting Powers. Such notice shall be communicated in writing to the Government of the United States, which shall immediately transmit a certified copy of the notification to the other Powers and inform them of the date on which it was received. The notice shall be deemed to have been given and shall take effect on that date. In the event of notice of termination being given by the Government of the United States, such notice shall be given to the diplomatic representatives at Washington of the other Contracting Powers, and the notice shall be deemed to have been given and shall take effect on the date of the communication made to the said diplomatic representatives.

Within one year of the date on which a notice of termination by any Power has taken effect, all the Contracting Powers shall meet in conference.

ARTICLE XXIV.

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the Contracting Powers in accordance with their respective constitutional methods and shall take effect on the date of the deposit of all the ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible. The Government of the United States will transmit to the other Contracting

Powers a certified copy of the *procès-verbal* of the deposit of ratifications.

The present Treaty, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States, and duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the other Contracting Powers.

In faith whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty.

Done at the City of Washington the sixth day of February, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Two.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES
HENRY CABOT LODGE
OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD
ELIHU ROOT
ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR
LEE OF FAREHAM
A. C. GEDDES
R. L. BORDEN
G. F. PEARCE
JOHN W. SALMOND
ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR
V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI
A. SARRAUT
JUSSERAND
CARLO SCHANZER
V. ROLANDI RICCI
LUIGI ALBERTINI
T. KATO
K. SHIDEHARA
M. HANIHARA

APPENDIX C

A TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE BRITISH EMPIRE, FRANCE, AND JAPAN, SIGNED 13TH DECEMBER 1921, RELATING TO THEIR INSULAR POSSESSIONS AND INSULAR DOMINIONS IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

THE United States of America, the British Empire, France and Japan,

With a view to the preservation of the general peace and the maintenance of their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean,

Have determined to conclude a Treaty to this effect and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries :

The President of the United States of America :
Charles Evans Hughes,
Henry Cabot Lodge,
Oscar W. Underwood and
Elihu Root, citizens of the United States ;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India ;

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P., Lord President of His Privy Council ;

The Right Honourable Baron Lee of Fareham, G.B.E., K.C.B., First Lord of His Admiralty ;

The Right Honourable Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, K.C.B., His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America ;

And

for the Dominion of Canada :

The Right Honourable Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G., K.C. ;

for the Commonwealth of Australia :

Senator the Right Honourable George Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and Territories ;

for the Dominion of New Zealand :

Sir John William Salmond, K.C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand ;

for the Union of South Africa :

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P. ;

for India :

The Right Honourable Valingman Sankaranarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State ;

The President of the French Republic :

Mr. René Viviani, Deputy, Former President of the Council of Ministers ;

Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the Colonies ;

Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America, Grand Cross of the National Order of the Legion of Honour ;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan :

Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Grand Cordon of the Rising Sun with the Paulownia Flower ;

Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington, Joshii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun ;

Prince Iyesato Tokugawa, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun ;

Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the Second Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun ;

Who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows :

I.

The High Contracting Parties agree as between themselves to respect their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

If there should develop between any of the High Contracting Parties a controversy arising out of any Pacific question and involving their said rights which is not satisfactorily settled by diplomacy and is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between them, they shall invite the other High Contracting

Parties to a joint conference to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment.

II.

If the said rights are threatened by the aggressive action of any other Power, the High Contracting Parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately, to meet the exigencies of the particular situation.

III.

This Treaty shall remain in force for ten years from the time it shall take effect, and after the expiration of said period it shall continue to be in force subject to the right of any of the High Contracting Parties to terminate it upon twelve months' notice.

IV.

This Treaty shall be ratified as soon as possible in accordance with the constitutional methods of the High Contracting Parties and shall take effect on the deposit of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington, and thereupon the agreement between Great Britain and Japan, which was concluded at London on July 13, 1911, shall terminate. The Government of the United States will transmit to all the Signatory Powers a certified copy of the *procès-verbal* of the deposit of ratifications.

The present Treaty, in French and in English,

FOUR-POWER TREATY

shall remain deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United States, and duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to each of the Signatory Powers.

In faith whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty.

Done at the City of Washington, the thirteenth day of December, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-One.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES [L. S.]

HENRY CABOT LODGE [L. S.]

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD [L. S.]

ELIHU ROOT [L. S.]

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR [L. S.]

LEE OF FAREHAM [L. S.]

A. C. GEDDES [L. S.]

[L. S.] R. L. BORDEN

[L. S.] G. F. PEARCE

[L. S.] JOHN W. SALMOND

[L. S.] ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

[L. S.] V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

[L. S.] RENÉ VIVIANI

[L. S.] A. SARRAUT

[L. S.] JUSSE RAND

[L. S.] T. KATO

[L. S.] K. SHIDEHARA

[L. S.] TOKUGAWA IYESATO

[L. S.] M. HANIHARA

DECLARATION ACCOMPANYING THE ABOVE
FOUR-POWER TREATY

In signing the Treaty this day between The United States of America, The British Empire, France and Japan, it is declared to be the understanding and intent of the Signatory Powers :

1. That the Treaty shall apply to the Mandated Islands in the Pacific Ocean ; provided, however, that the making of the Treaty shall not be deemed to be an assent on the part of The United States of America to the mandates and shall not preclude agreements between The United States of America and the Mandatory Powers respectively in relation to the mandated islands.

2. That the controversies to which the second paragraph of Article I refers shall not be taken to embrace questions which according to principles of international law lie exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the respective Powers.

Washington, D.C., December 13, 1921.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

HENRY CABOT LODGE

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD

ELIHU ROOT

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

LEE OF FAREHAM

A. C. GEDDES

R. L. BORDEN

G. F. PEARCE

JOHN W. SALMOND

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

FOUR-POWER TREATY

V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

RENÉ VIVIANI

A. SARRAUT

JUSSERAND

T. KATO

K. SHIDEHARA

TOKUGAWA IYESATO

M. HANIHARA

A TREATY BETWEEN THE SAME FOUR POWERS,
SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE ABOVE, SIGNED
6TH FEBRUARY 1922

The United States of America, the British Empire, France and Japan have, through their respective Plenipotentiaries, agreed upon the following stipulations supplementary to the Quadruple Treaty signed at Washington on December 13, 1921 :

The term 'insular possessions and insular dominions' used in the aforesaid Treaty shall, in its application to Japan, include only Karafuto (or the Southern portion of the island of Sakhalin), Formosa and the Pescadores, and the islands under the mandate of Japan.

The present agreement shall have the same force and effect as the said Treaty to which it is supplementary.

The provisions of Article IV of the aforesaid Treaty of December 13, 1921, relating to ratification shall be applicable to the present Agreement, which in French and English shall remain deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United

States, and duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to each of the other Contracting Powers.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Agreement.

Done at the City of Washington, the sixth day of February, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-two.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES [L. S.]

HENRY CABOT LODGE [L. S.]

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD [L. S.]

[L. S.] ELIHU ROOT

[L. S.] ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

[L. S.] LEE OF FAREHAM

[L. S.] A. C. GEDDES

[L. S.] R. L. BORDEN

[L. S.] G. F. PEARCE

[L. S.] JOHN W. SALMOND

[L. S.] ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

[L. S.] V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

A. SARRAUT [L. S.]

JUSSERAND [L. S.]

T. KATO [L. S.]

K. SHIDEHARA [L. S.]

M. HANIHARA [L. S.]

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

Date Due

UNIVERSITY OF P.E.I. LIBRARY



3 7348 00285518 7